The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 30, 1896.

The Week.

THE outcome of the Government loan for $100,000,000 seems to be something like this: The "popular" branch of it will fall considerably short of making up the total. These bids are coming in from day to day, but the public cannot know what they amount to until the 5th of February. Although the Morgan syndicate has been dissolved, some of the members have put in bids for a part of the loan, and others stand ready to take what is left. Whether any part of the loan goes abroad will depend upon the price at which this remainder can be bought. Some of the bidders in the "popular" branch are vociferously demanding that the Government itself fix a price on the bonds, although they have been offered to highest bidder not less than par. Unfortunately, this cannot be done. The Secretary may reject any or all bids, but that does not enable him to issue a general order to A, B, and C to come up and take the bonds at any price he chooses to fix upon them. Moreover, some people, moved by what they call patriotism, or a desire for notoriety, will put in bids for small amounts at rates equal to a 3 per cent. loan, while the money market in general declines to lend at that rate. Then there will be a certain amount of "squealing," as often happens in Wall Street when the speculators find themselves loaded with stocks that they cannot get rid of without loss.

We assume that the whole $100,000,000 will be taken at rates varying somewhat, but not below that which the syndicate was prepared to bid. The next question is whether that sum will suffice. In the absence of any new disturbance, such as another war scare or a tidal wave of silver lunacy, which is not to be looked for, it is probable that this loan will carry us beyond the Presidential election. It is not to be assumed, however, that it will put the gold reserve permanently beyond danger. We must remember that three bond sales have taken place previously for this same purpose, amounting in the aggregate to $162,000,000. The plan proposed by the syndicate, to take $100,000,000 firm and give the Government the option of $100,000,000 more, was much the best, because that would have quieted all apprehensions and have given time for business interests to make plans for the future. This was and is the immediate problem of finance, the remoter one being some method of relieving the Government of the necessity of providing and maintaining the gold reserve of commerce. The "popular" loan which intervened, although politically unavoidable, was financially a mistake.

The Treasury officials say they are much puzzled over the falling off in internal-revenue receipts, particularly in the returns from the tax on whiskey. This tax the new law increased from 90 cents a gallon to $1.10. It was a simple sum in arithmetic for our wise legislators to figure out that an increase of 20 per cent. in the tax would necessarily mean an increase of 20 per cent. in the revenue. Nothing could be clearer than that. No, nothing could be clearer, except that it has been proved over and over again in fiscal experience that such expectations are never realized. Taxes cut in two sometimes double the revenue, but taxes doubled usually come nearer to halving the revenue. Ever since William Pitt's day this has been almost axiomatic with English Chancellors of the Exchequer. It should have been axiomatic in this country at least ever since Mr. Wells's practical demonstrations in this very matter of the whiskey tax. But no, our cheerful legislators are never so cheerful as when disregarding all human experience in finance and taxation. They violate well-known laws, and, when they get hurt, look around with a half-pained, half-angry air, and say, "Hang it all! Who would have thought the thing would work in this way?" The classical authority in American taxation is not Turgot, or Adam Smith, or Pitt, or Gladstone, or Wells, or McCulloch, but the Congressman with his famous dictum, "Do not tell me that a government which has put down a great rebellion cannot collect a tax of two dollars a gallon on whiskey!" But it couldn't, and the tax of $1.10, laid with similar patriotic snorts, appears to be falling into line with universal experience in the most disgusting way.

The chaplain of the House continues his blasphemous prayers. As a way of calling the Almighty's attention to the wickedness of Jones of Nevada in "holding up" the tariff bill in the Senate finance committee, he "prayed" last week for "additional protection to American manufacturers," so that they might "put an end to the privations of American workingmen." Washington correspondents are making merry over the chaplain's performances, and they surely can plead that there is a difference between laughing at religion and laughing at those who make religion ridiculous. But the thing has already passed beyond the stage of ridicule, and become a question of how to put an end to sacrilege. What is the use of talking of a great cathedral in Washington, if this spectacle of hideous impiety is to be allowed in the national legislature? It is high time that "the church vote" made itself felt, in connection with this public scandal, not to let the Jingo vote, the high-tariff vote, the Cuban vote, the generally quarrelsome and repulsive and underbred and Heaven-defying vote, have everything their own way in congressional devotions.

Quorum-counting by the Speaker has now been quietly abandoned by the Speaker who introduced it without authority, and who gloried in it throughout the Fifty-first Congress as his chief title to fame and all the good things that go with fame. Mr. Reed's offence in 1890 was, as Mr. Crisp pointed out on Thursday, not in counting a quorum after the rules of the House authorized him to do so, but in seizing the power to do so before the rules were adopted. In short, he usurped authority in order to get a rule giving him authority. But even that rule he now throws over, thereby practically confessing that it could not be made to work without gross unfairness and mistakes, and goes back to a form of the rule first proposed years ago by a Democratic Congressman, Mr. Tucker. Under the rule as now adopted, the sergeant-at-arms is to bring in absent members, and their presence is to be noted by the clerk on the roll-call. Thereafter they are to be considered as present and helping to make a quorum even if they refuse to vote. This is a very different thing from letting the Speaker's fallible eye wander about, guessing who is in the cloak-rooms and corridors, and counting as present members who were (as happened more than once in 1890) in the opposite end of Washington or actually in Baltimore. The new method is certain to be more orderly and accurate, and its adoption with so little clamor, with the quiet handing over to oblivion of the great constitutional right of the Speaker to do the counting himself, probably marks a general acquiescence in it as the best solution of the difficulty.

It would be well if the tomfoolery which goes on at Washington never took a more harmful guise than that which the *Congressional Record* of January 20 presents, ten pages of which are occupied with facts sent in by the President in answer to the House resolutions calling for information touching certain speeches made by Thomas F. Bayard in England. First we have a letter from Mr. Olney, enclosing one from Mr. Bayard, enclosing his speech of November 7, 1895, before the Edinburgh Philosophical Society. The speech, he says, was made to a society of a non-political character, which society had been addressed by his predecessors in office, Mr. Lowell and Mr. Phelps, in response to invitations. The opinions

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expressed, Mr. Bayard says, are his opinions, "formed by me after careful deliberation." He adds ominously that "when Congress shall have concluded its action on the subject, it is possible that I may desire to submit a further statement." The speech itself is then printed at length, filling eight columns of the *Record*. That comes under date London, December 12, but is only the beginning. Under date of January 3 a cable despatch was sent by Olney to Bayard saying that the House wanted information about an earlier speech, which referred to the President as one who "stood in the midst of a strong, self-confident, and oftentimes violent people—men who sought to have their own way." The speech referred to, Mr. Bayard says, was delivered at the opening of the Boston Grammar School in August last. He tells what the Boston Grammar School is, and how he was invited to attend the opening exercises, and how he joined the others in a dinner after the exercises, where toasts were given and responded to extemporaneously, he being one of the responders. Then he encloses a newspaper containing a report of the whole proceedings, including a list of the scholars who took prizes, reports of the examinations in the classics and mathematics, all the speeches, including his own, to the extent of fourteen columns of the *Record*. We hope that the House will derive profit from this report. By giving their entire time to it for the remainder of the session they would relieve the country very much.

The two Senators from the new State of Utah were sworn in on Monday, and the seats in the upper branch are now all filled, except one from Delaware, which will doubtless soon be awarded to the Republican claimant. The full Senate now consists of ninety members—almost twice as many as sixty years ago, and one-third more than at the outbreak of the civil war, while almost one-sixth have come in during the last half-dozen years. The Senate was never so large a body as now, and it never stood lower in the public esteem. The most striking feature in the development of Congress during the past quarter of a century, and particularly during the last ten years, has been the steady and of late rapid decline in the Senate, as compared both with its own past and with the House of Representatives at the present time. Until a comparatively recent period, the upper branch of Congress maintained to a great extent its ancient hold upon the public mind as a far more dignified, conservative, and able body than the House—a body which could be trusted to resist a popular craze, as in 1868 it defeated the wild scheme for deposing Andrew Johnson through an abuse of the impeachment power. This position has now been entirely forfeited. The Senate to-day is a less conservative body than the House, and it is more easily carried for any wild scheme. Not only has it lost its old hold upon the public, but it is regarded with a growing contempt.

Mr. Sewell of New Jersey is one of the last members of the Senate from whom the country is wont to expect either the presentation of a notable proposition or an argument that deserves attention. But the anti-Jingo resolution which he introduced a fortnight ago was striking in itself, and it was supported last week in a speech that was full of good sense and sound reasoning. The New Jersey Senator began by tracing the origin of the Monroe Doctrine and setting forth the limitations that were then put upon it, in contrast with the attempts now made to extend it over half the globe. He pointed out that the position taken by the President and the Secretary of State in the Venezuelan matter "practically means that this Government must assume a protectorate over Mexico, Central America, and all the South American states, and that, no matter whether these states be right or wrong, in any case of a conflict with a European Power we pledge ourselves as an ally to furnish men and munitions of war, and force enough to protect the weaker American Power against the stronger European Power." What such a policy would mean in the case of Venezuela he shrewdly showed by quoting the remark of Mr. Olney in his correspondence, that "in 1848 Venezuela entered upon a period of civil commotions, which lasted for more than a quarter of a century, and the negotiations thus interrupted in 1844 were not resumed until 1876."

The closing passages of Mr. Sewell's speech were rendered particularly noteworthy by the fact that he showed some perception of the condition of the country, and of the folly of unnecessarily precipitating an international controversy now—and such an attitude of mind has unhappily become a rarity in the Senate. He expressed his conviction that a matter which has been slumbering so many years in a state of diplomatic repose might have been delayed at least a few months longer, and reminded his colleagues that "if we address ourselves to the proper ordering of our domestic economies, we have quite enough now to engage our full time, and upon which to exert our best mental energies." While believing that the executive ought to uphold the honor of the nation, he holds that "we have a right to expect that discretion and good judgment will be exercised in bringing to a culmination an issue so grave and serious as that now presented," and he pronounced the President's action "in this respect alike unseasonable and premature," in view of the facts that the country is yet "in a state of convalescence from the financial malady of 1893," and that "the still unsettled and troublous condition of its financial affairs is too strongly in evidence to warrant the putting of any further unnecessary strain upon it." In short, Mr. Sewell's speech was full of words of truth and soberness. The wonder is that the Shermans and Morrills and other veterans of the Senate should have left the utterance of such words to a member whose standing does not lend them the added weight that they would receive coming from a leader of national reputation and influence.

Senator Frye of Maine is a nice man to make an uproar about the Armenian massacres. He is the calm, sensible legislator who expressed his regret that Spain apologized for the *Alliança* incident. War for war's sake has no warmer friend, and war produces everywhere the state of things which we are deploring in Armenia. It makes widows and orphans by the thousand; it destroys towns, cities, and villages, and spreads famine and pestilence and destroys crops, and in fact reduces the seat of operations to the condition in which Armenia is to-day. Part of the reluctance of the Powers to tackle the Turk is due to the dread of reducing large regions of Europe to a similar condition. This is not an unworthy fear. Of course it is a reproach to our civilization that there should be any occasion for it—that the Powers should not be able to agree to abate the terrible nuisance known as Turkey without falling out among themselves; but we who are afraid that an agreement between Great Britain and Venezuela about a boundary line may endanger our institutions, are hardly in a position to find fault with them. Every country contains its Jingoes, and there is nothing like the Jingo imagination for detecting danger from foreign machinations. If the Powers had one-quarter the suspicion of each other that an American Jingo has of Great Britain, they would be fighting like demons all the time. The way our Senate is going on just now, without either army or navy, gives one, we fear, but a faint idea of the way it would go on in meddling, threatening, and "claiming" if it had the great navy which so many of us are longing for. Fancy such an instrument of destruction in the hands of men like Senators Frye and Morgan and Davis. The true responsibility for what is happening in Armenia rests with Russia and Germany — with Russia for not offering to restore order in Armenia under a "mandate," as the French did in Greece in 1828, and in Syria in 1860, and Austria in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1877; and Germany for not sustaining England in the recent demonstrations. The notion that we can apply pressure to the Porte which England cannot or will not apply, is one of the whimsies of the day.

The Boston *Herald* says:

"Some of the greatest men of our country have had this habit of drinking heavily—it has gone into history as a weakness in their cha-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

racters; but when there has been no public display, the mantle of charity has been cast over it by their contemporaries. It is better to answer the argument of Senator Morgan than to abuse him for his personal habits."

Well, the "mantle of charity" was grossly misused when it was cast over this "weakness." Anyhow, whatever excuse a public man may have had for "drinking heavily" fifty years ago, he has none to-day. If he cannot stop it, he ought to get out of public life. It is preposterous to make abstinence a condition of employment in an engineer of a locomotive, or in a captain of a liner, and allow a statesman whose blunders may any day bring on a bloody war, to get drunk as often as he pleases and then whine for the "mantle of charity." We believe we are the only civilized people to-day who allow men high in office to roll in the gutter with impunity. In the early part of the century it was not so. Everybody got drunk occasionally. But there has been an immense change in manners since then, and the nation ought to get the benefit of it, as well as railroads, steamboats, and factories. It is monstrous that drunkards should be incapacitated for every service but the public service. As to Senator Morgan's "arguments," we shall answer them when we see them. We know of none at present. With his blatherskite we are very familiar, but blatherskite is not refutable.

Commodore Sicard made some remarks last Thursday about the condition of our navy which are likely to call down upon him the rebukes of the Jingoes who are eager for immediate war with England:

"The ships we have so far are good ones, but we really are only upon the threshold of the development of such a navy as we should have. We have a number of good cruisers, but it is the battle-ships that are really necessary in war. We need about fifteen or twenty more ships—good battle-ships. It takes four or five years to build a battle-ship, and that is time enough to be beaten many times over."

Lodge and Chandler ought to introduce a resolution at once expressing in stern terms their disapproval of a naval officer who will admit that we have only the beginning of a navy, that cruisers are really of small account in a war, and that before we could get an efficient navy constructed we might be "beaten many times over." What Commodore Sicard says is, it is true, what every competent and frank naval officer has been saying in private for weeks past; but what do the Jingo warriors care about that? Naval officers are aware that cruisers would be of small use to us in a war with England, because the two nations which sell coal are England and America, and our cruisers would not be able to replenish their supply if they were to get away from American ports. They know also that what is needed to protect American seaboard cities is battle-ships, of which we have only a few at present, and these would offer small resistance to England's powerful ships. But what do the Jingoes care for little things like these? They do not propose to fight, but to stay at home and read about the war in the "extras." They believe that war is necessary "to develop the manhood of the nation"; but it is not their manhood which needs development, but that of some other fellow. Theirs is all right. It flinches at no danger which somebody else will have to encounter.

The coming season ought to be an unusually profitable one for the ocean steamship companies, as there is to be an immense and enforced emigration of Americans. Already the numbers are portentously large of those upon whom notice has been served by the Jingo press that they cannot stay in this country, but must go at once to England, where they belong; and the list is extending every day. The college professors as a body will have to go, under the terms of this new alien and sedition act, together with the great majority of the clergy, the Chamber of Commerce, most merchants and bankers, and a few (we are thankful to say only a few) editors. It appears to-day that the "pro-English party" is now in the majority in the United States Senate, prepared to side-track the Davis resolutions. So at least fifty Senators will have to emigrate. The House foreign affairs committee is pro-English too, and of course must go also, along with the Speaker and a majority of the House. All these classes come, by their actions, under the head of "pernicious foreigners" whom newspapers have the constitutional right to expel the country on thirty days' notice. In a crisis like the present they only weaken us. We must offer a united front to the enemy. We must not allow foreigners to suspect for a moment that there is a single man in this country who ever thinks, or asks the reason why he must do and die, or does anything but bellow and foam at the mouth.

Nobody will be surprised to learn that the McKinley boom is encountering obstacles in Ohio. All his enemies among the Republican managers in his State, and they are neither few nor weak, have declared over and over again that they are for Ohio's Favorite Son, heart and soul, and yet McKinley is not happy nor are his friends at ease. The radical trouble seems to be that no Republican politician in Ohio trusts any other Republican politician, and all of them expect "treachery" as a matter of course. Foraker, for example, has taken occasion publicly to declare that Ohio must support McKinley with enthusiasm, and yet McKinley organs announce that "ill-advised persons" in various sections of Ohio who "pretend to be friends of Foraker" are seeking to "inject him into the Presidential race." Wicked Democratic organs go much further, and insist that Foraker is bent on "knifing" McKinley, and that the Ohio delegation to the St. Louis convention will be made up of men who will shout for McKinley in public, but will drop him the first moment they can find any excuse. At best the situation is not promising for "the logical candidate"; at worst, his chances of getting the nomination will be no better than Sherman's have so often proved to be.

The inaugural address of the new Governor of New Jersey would be a striking document in itself, even if had not the advantage of being in such sharp contrast with the floods of inanity or folly with which other governors have been inundating their Legislatures. Mr. Griggs's description of the plague of over-legislation from which New Jersey (and, he might have said, every State and the whole nation) is suffering, strikes home. The mass of hasty, ill-considered, ill-expressed, and conflicting laws on all subjects that stuffs the general statutes is appalling. No lawyer can find his way through the jungle; the courts can but contradict each other and themselves in interpreting the hotch-potch. When the general statutes of New Jersey, under a Constitution supposed to prevent all special or class legislation, fill three large volumes of 1,000 pages each—or twice as much space as the revised statutes of the United States—the greatness of the evil is apparent. Nothing but endless litigation, uncertainty, waste, destruction of property, and contempt for government and courts can result from this huge conflict of laws. Against the general and pernicious superstition that all the ills of humanity can be cured by law, Gov. Griggs squarely arrays himself, and flatly says that he will veto every law which has not some positive and convincing reasons to justify it. Laws enacted out of mutual complacence will find no toleration from him, he serves notice.

For years the sugar interests of the Argentine Republic have enjoyed the benefit of a high protective tariff on imported sugars. With cane cheaper than in any other country, with no duty to pay on imported machinery, and with labor under perfect control at low wages, the price of sugar in that country has been more than double the cost of the imported article minus the duty. This condition of things naturally caused overproduction until the demand was exceeded by many thousand tons. To avert the logical result—a lowering of prices—the sugar-makers are forced to export and dispose of their surplus in the open market. To recoup them for the loss involved, a pliant minister of finance has considerately submitted to the Chambers a project to levy an internal tax of 4 cents a kilogramme on all sugars sold in the republic, and to devote the fund so acquired to a bounty of 12 cents a kilogramme to the producers for every kilogramme exported. Here we have the doctrine of protection "developed" with the severe logic of an Olney mind getting out of a doctrine "all there is in it."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE "DOCTRINE."

Now that we are nearing the close of the Jingo craze, it is impossible for the calm observer to avoid the conclusion that it owed much of its gravity and extent to the fashion of calling the policy recommended by President Monroe by the name of "doctrine." When it was first called a "doctrine," we are not yet able to say with positiveness, but it was apparently long after 1823. The expression was not used during the discussion in Congress of a proposition to send delegates to the Panama Congress in 1826, which involved frequent references to Mr. Monroe's statement. A passage in a speech of Daniel Webster's made on April 14, in the course of that debate, shows that the term "doctrine" had not then become fixed, and that there was in Mr. Webster's mind, and probably in that of the public, a clear appreciation of the fact that President Monroe was not teaching a doctrine, but was making a declaration of policy with regard to our own interests exclusively, when he issued his celebrated message. Here it is, and we have italicized the expressions which confirm our view:

> "It is, doubtless, true, as I took occasion to observe the other day, that this *declaration* must be considered as founded on our rights, and to spring mainly from a regard to their preservation. It did not commit us, at all events, to take up arms on any indication of hostile feeling by the Powers of Europe towards South America. If, for example, all the States of Europe had refused to trade with South America until her states should return to their former allegiance, that would have furnished no cause of interference to us. Or, if an armament had been furnished by the Allies to act against provinces the most remote from us, as Chili or Buenos Ayres, the distance of the scene of action, *diminishing our apprehension of danger*, and diminishing, also, *our means of effectual interposition*, might still have left us to content ourselves with remonstrance. But a very different case would have arisen if an army, equipped and maintained by these Powers, had been landed on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico, and commenced the war in our own immediate neighborhood. Such an event might justly be regarded as *dangerous to ourselves*, and, on that ground, to have called for decided and immediate interference by us. The sentiments and *the policy* announced by the *declaration* thus understood were, therefore, in strict conformity to our duties and *our interests*."

In 1848 President Polk sent to Congress a message, regarding affairs in Yucatan, which provoked a debate that involved frequent references to Mr. Monroe's position, and in this debate we find the expression "doctrine" used more than once. "The President," said Mr. Holmes of South Carolina, "had taken the opportunity of reiterating a doctrine which was said to be the doctrine of Mr. Monroe; and there never was a more inappropriate time for the assertion of that doctrine, even if it did apply." Mr. Bagby of Alabama "did not think that the doctrine contained in the declaration of Mr. Monroe either sanctioned or discountenanced this measure." But even at that time doctrine was not universally accepted as the proper term, and Mr. Root of New York referred to an assertion that "Mr. Monroe had committed us by his declaration in 1823." Whether called a declaration or a doctrine, it had not yet acquired the sacroscant character now ascribed to it. Mr. Root declared that Mr. Monroe had no authority to commit succeeding generations by his declaration, and even went so far as flippantly to remark: "It was sometimes very convenient, when gentlemen had a point to carry, to resort to some of Mr. Monroe's old musty letters."

At all events, "doctrine" is an unfortunate term—in the first place, because it is not strictly descriptive. But the second objection to it is more serious. It is that the term fell among a people bred in theological discussion, and accustomed to use doctrine as a term of mystery and divine authority. Webster gives various definitions of it, such as "teaching," "instruction," like "Christ's doctrine," or "a body of principles of faith," like the "doctrine of atoms," or "the doctrine of gravitation," or "the doctrines of the Bible." He mentions the Monroe Doctrine, but he gives no definition of "doctrine" which will cover Monroe's recommendation. In fact, in popular use, both in Monroe's time and down to our own day, a doctrine was something with superhuman authority behind it, and which could not be approached from a purely mundane point of view. To the ordinary "plain American," a doctrine is something different from, and much more serious than, an opinion, or theory, or recommendation; something to be handled more reverently and to be accepted with less question. He finds it difficult to believe, therefore, that Monroe's advice to interfere in the affairs of the Spanish-American states if they are attacked by a European Power is a piece of political advice, to be examined (like every other) as a piece of policy with reference to time, place and circumstances, and probable result.

If any one doubts this, we advise him to make an experiment with any of his older neighbors by propounding to him, for acceptance, separately and apart from the others, any one of the "developments" of the Monroe Doctrine to be found in Secretary Olney's despatch of July 20, for example. Ask him whether, when a community of "yellow-bellied Dagoes" down there quarrels with a European Power, we ought to take it for granted that the European Power is in the wrong and the Dagoes in the right; or whether the Dagoes ought to be allowed to choose a European arbitrator in any of their quarrels; or whether a Dago ought to be allowed to accept the boundary claim of a European colony to his own detriment, or to enter into an alliance with a European Power against one of his sister republics; whether the Dago states, Chili or Peru, for example, by "natural sympathy, by similarity of governmental institution," were "our natural friends and allies, commercially and politically," more so than England; whether we were "practically sovereign on this continent and our fiat law" in any matter about which we choose to concern ourselves. Ask him these questions without letting him perceive your object, and he will undoubtedly laugh a merry laugh, and ask you for whom you take him, or request you "to give him an easier one." But if you then go on and tell him that all these things are part and parcel of the Monroe Doctrine, that they flow out of it, he will at once become grave and reverential, and say: "Ah, that is a different matter. If it is all in the Monroe Doctrine, I have nothing to say. I am for the Monroe Doctrine every time." And he will support the Monroe Doctrine, and "stand behind" any one who recommends its application, without discussion or examination, just as a Mussulman rallies to the sacred standard in a holy war. The Monroe Doctrine, like all doctrines firmly held, is fundamental, above criticism, something to fight for and die for, like all articles of religious faith.

The inconvenience, for a great commercial state, of having a doctrine of this sort, which intimately concerns not our eternal but our temporal welfare, is not discussable, and has to be enforced without regard to consequences, has been made very plain during the past few weeks. If Monroe's opinion were called, not a doctrine but a policy, we think there is hardly a doubt that the appointment of a commission like that now serving to report on the boundary between Great Britain and Venezuela would have taken place in a quiet and gentlemanly way, as the result of friendly communication with Great Britain. Policy is something intended for human happiness, and to be considered with reference to human comfort and convenience, while doctrine concerns the things of the spirit, the unknown or unknowable concerns of the individual soul. A nation which lives by doctrine is necessarily, like Turkey, somewhat, at least, of a theocracy. It has often to pursue courses in obedience to the doctrine which are full of misery for man as a member of human society. A nation which lives by policy or expediency, on the other hand, asks itself at every step, "Does this make for justice, for peace, for law? Is it reasonable? Will it increase the burdens or promote the comfort of the poor? Will it cherish the great interests of civilization, the spread of knowledge, the rule of science, the feeling of brotherhood among the sorely tried and much puzzled nations of the earth?" Of all the misfortunes which can overtake a society, the greatest is having to live under a dominion which cannot be discussed, and which cannot be judged by its probable results.

For these reasons, and many others for which we have no space here, we think the chances of future peace and order on this continent would be much improved if we got into the way of talking of the Monroe Doctrine as the Monroe Policy, and taught the coming generation that,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

far from being a thing to die for, it was a thing to examine when the time came for its use, just like taxation, or the liquor question, or good roads, or judicial organization. This Government was founded first and foremost for the benefit of citizens of the United States, and not for that of Venezuelans, Guatemalans, Costa Ricans, or Chilians. Monroe meant his doctrine avowedly to subserve, before all else, the safety, honor, and welfare of his own country.

HOMŒOPATHY IN GOVERNMENT.

When the Jingo craze was at its height, the story reached us, through an excellent channel, that the excuse for Mr. Cleveland's message was that he had learned that the Republicans in Congress were preparing, and would surely pass, a war-like resolution directed against England, and that he felt compelled, as a politician, to forestall them, in his own interest and that of his party. On Thursday the *Evening Post* printed a despatch from its Washington correspondent, containing another version of the same story, on still better authority. This ran as follows:

"We all knew it [the Davis resolution] as long ago as last spring. The scheme was carefully hatched, undoubtedly for political purposes and nothing higher. The President simply headed it off. The public furor which this action of Congress would have brought about has simply been discounted, and, now that the Jingo resolution is before the people, it is found to have spent its force. The people found all they wanted in the President's message, and have no use for the Senate resolution. The Senate has already discovered this. As a result the Davis resolution won't pass the Senate. Mark my prophecy. It is losing friends every day. . . . Had Congress, however, acting by itself, passed such a measure as the Davis resolution on the eve of Great Britain's assertion of her claim in Venezuela, it would have been equivalent to a declaration of war. I contend, therefore, that the President performed a valuable public service in the interests of peace in forestalling Congress and robbing it of its hostile ammunition."

Here, as will be seen, the President acts simply in the interest of peace, and not in that of party. He hears that Congress is disposed to declare war, so he determines to declare it in advance of them, in the belief that his war would not be taken so seriously as the congressional war, and would be more readily got rid of.

There are two weaknesses in this story. One is that Congress, far from leaving him to fight the British alone, immediately "stood behind him," and endorsed his war measure without debate—an incident, we think, without parallel in the history of parliamentary government. The craziest war venture of any modern nation was that of France in 1870, but that project was before the Chambers and under discussion for nearly two weeks—that is, from July 6 to July 19. What frightened the country and the world in December was not what Congress said or did, but what the President said and did, for he held the confidence of the country for steadiness and self-control and courage and rationality, in a remarkable degree. Congress, speaking alone, would not have made much excitement, because its action would have been set down to "politics," and Mr. Cleveland would have been relied on to prevent any mischievous result. It was Mr. Cleveland, therefore, and Mr. Cleveland alone, who made the panic, and he virtually confessed in his second, hysterical message, that he had not duly considered the possible consequences of the step he was taking.

The second weakness of the story is more serious. It is a confession that our sanest statesman was ready on a pinch to administer the Government on homœopathic principles; that is, when he heard that a coördinate branch was going to engage in an enterprise injurious in the highest degree to the national interests, he was prepared to anticipate it by administering to the unfortunate people a smaller dose of the same stuff. Foreseeing that Congress would shortly get drunk, he determined, by way of cure, to anticipate their bout by one of his own, feeling that his own recovery would be speedier than theirs and less costly. But the result was that they joined him in his carouse, and they both went to work to smash the national furniture and crockery. We have not a word to say against the homœopathic system as a therapeutic agency for the human body, but in daily life no one calls in a homœopathic doctor without knowing what he is about, and the nature of the remedies to be prescribed to him. The President of the United States has no license to practise it on the people of the United States. It would be impossible to find in any debate or discussion of the Constitution the smallest authority for the doctrine that the President may head off anticipated folly on the part of Congress by minor folly of his own.

The framers of the Constitution had evidently never dreamed that any such theory of the President's powers or duties would ever see the light, much less be accepted. Hamilton says in the *Federalist:*

"The republican principle demands that the deliberate sense of the community should govern the conduct of those to whom they intrust the management of their affairs; but it does not require an unqualified complaisance to every sudden breeze of passion, or to every transient impulse which the people may receive from the arts of men who flatter their prejudices to betray their interests. It is a just observation that the people commonly *intend* the public good. This often applies to their very errors. But their good sense would despise the adulator who should pretend that they always *reason right* about the *means* of promoting it. They know from experience that they sometimes err; and the wonder is that they so seldom err as they do, beset, as they continually are, by the wiles of parasites and sycophants, by the snares of the ambitious, the avaricious, the desperate, by the artifices of men who possess their confidence more than they deserve it, and of those who seek to possess rather than to deserve it. When occasions present themselves in which the interests of the people are at variance with their inclinations, it is the duty of the persons whom they have appointed to be the guardians of those interests, *to withstand the temporary delusion in order to give them time and opportunity for more cool and sedate reflection.* Instances might be cited in which a conduct of this kind has saved the people from very fatal consequences of their own mistakes, and has procured lasting monuments of their gratitude to men who had courage and magnanimity enough to serve them at the peril of their displeasure."

With the position which Mr. Cleveland had before the country in November last he could well have waited calmly for any act of folly the majority in Congress could commit. He was waiting in that attitude for their financial or fiscal follies. He expected, and the public expected him, to meet them with a veto. Nay, his enemies in Congress used the certainty of a veto as a reason for not being so foolish as they would have liked. He was put in the Presidency to stand guard against such things as the Davis resolution, as much as against a free-silver bill or a McKinley tariff. There was no likelihood that Congress would exercise the war-declaring power. What was to be anticipated was a blatherskite concurrent resolution, like the one now before the Senate, and that he could have met with a veto which would have given him the opportunity of his life, and sent him out of office with a reputation following close on that of Washington and Lincoln. He might in such a veto have explained the exact condition of the Venezuelan negotiations, and have revealed our own ignorance of the merits of the controversy, have announced his plan for seeking light on the subject, have defined the nature and scope of the "Monroe Doctrine," the rights it proclaims and the duties it imposes, and have, at the same time, formulated the American view of war as a means of settling controversies among nations, in a way that would have made one of the great state papers of American history, and have substituted the Cleveland Doctrine for the Monroe Doctrine in the popular mind and memory. This is what those who most admired him and have longest supported him expected of him.

Their bitter disappointment is due to that most pernicious legacy of the Middle Ages, that fatal "relic of barbarism," the idea that even for us—"foremost in the files of time" as we consider ourselves—war is a thing not to be pondered or discussed; that when contemplating the most awful action that man can take against the peace and dignity of his fellow-man, it is base to reflect, to reason, to take counsel, to seek the better way; that in such crises the nearer we get to the enraged tiger or bulldog, the more reason we have to be proud of ourselves. If there was one man in the country whom last November we considered superior to this sad delusion, we should have said it was Mr. Cleveland. We consider his subserviency to it, next to the wild "standing behind" him when he issued his challenge, the saddest sight this century has witnessed.

TARIFF LEGISLATION.

Colorado held the attention of the country on Wednesday of last week in rather an impressive way. In addition to Senator Wolcott's brilliant speech on the Da-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vis resolution, Senator Teller delivered one on the tariff bill and the financial situation generally, which made a decided stir and is likely to have important consequences. Mr. Teller's speech, like that of his colleague, was effective in telling the truth at a critical moment, and knocking over a lot of humbugs that had been leaning against each other ever since the session began, maintaining an uncertain equilibrium, and sure to fall if anybody should give them a front blow.

The centre of Mr. Teller's attack was the House tariff bill which is still in the Senate committee on finance. The history of this bill is pretty well known. It was concocted by the Ohio wool-growing triumvirate—the same who laid the foundation for the McKinley tariff in 1889-'90. This interesting clique came to Washington before the present session began, and took steps to commit the Republican party to the enactment of a tariff on wool, not now, but a year or two hence, provided the party should be successful in the coming Presidential election. It was a game that these people were very familiar with. They had played it often. Revenue for the Government had nothing to do with it; but the Republican leaders, when the measure was forced upon them, put the revenue pretence forward as a stalking-horse. They passed the bill through the House as one of the happy financial conceits of the hour, along with the Venezuela Commission bill and the bond bill. It reached the Senate simultaneously with the bond bill, and both were referred to the finance committee, which is a free-silver committee presided over by the most pronounced gold-bug in the Senate.

This committee promptly substituted a free-coinage bill for the bond bill, and then sat upon the tariff bill, waiting to see what would be the effect on the temper of the House. The effect being *nil*, mutterings began to be heard in the free-silver camp to the effect that the tariff bill was a measure for the protection of wool-growers, that it was for revenue not to the Government but to private individuals, and that silver-miners were just as much entitled to a tax for their benefit as wool-growers or anybody else. Yet the McKinley organs were hopeful that, as Senator Jones, who held the balance of power in the committee, had been a good Republican before he went over to the Populists, he would allow free play to his natural instincts and let this little bill pass without a free-silver amendment. Such an amendment, if securely fastened to the wool bill, would kill the whole measure in the House. Hence the importance of getting it past the danger point of the finance committee.

It has not yet passed that point when Mr. Teller pounces upon it and shakes it as a terrier would shake a rat. His opinion of it was expressed in the following vigorous terms:

"I know very well that the free-silver bill will not become a law. But I am tired of being lectured by Senators who know equally well that the revenue bill will not become a law. There has never been the slightest expectation of its becoming a law. Even if it should be brought before the Senate and finally passed by the aid of two or three Populist votes, it would be sure to meet with an executive veto. Had you the slightest expectation of its ever becoming a law it would have been framed on very different lines. It was just put in to Congress as a political move, and for no other purpose. As this is to be a political play, we will play politics on our side."

This is something more than a hint that the Republican silver Senators are not to be coaxed or coerced into passing the tariff bill merely to give the wool-growers a good position at some future time. What the latter want is the chance to say, whenever the Republican party comes into full power: "You passed our bill when you could not get the approval of the executive; you committed yourselves to us then, and you cannot go back now; therefore please to pass it again." The free-silver Republicans have no particular objection to the wool bill *per se*. They simply want to force their own measure along with it. This they cannot do, and they know that they cannot, but neither will they allow any other measure for the private interest of a class to go through while theirs is kept behind, especially when its object is not of a practical nature at present, but is merely to commit the party to pass some similar bill at some future time.

It is in the interest of good government that Mr. Teller and those who stand with him should stand firm. The wool bill, besides being a bad measure, is a game of false pretences. The leading Republicans, in fact, do not want it to pass. The woollen industry of the country has scarcely yet adjusted itself to free wool, and now it is asked to turn a second summersault and adjust itself to a high tariff on its raw material. Of course this will not be the last of it. A new tax on wool will lead to renewed efforts to throw it off, and these efforts will be successful eventually. Meanwhile the business will be "all torn up." There can be no settled trade, no steady employment. It is bad enough to have all our industries based on the rolling stone of an uncertain standard of value. The woollen industries, if we set out on a new tariff adventure, will have to bear the silver trouble, which is common to all, and another one special to themselves. It will be something of a paradox if they find relief from the latter at the hands of those who are producing the former.

THE SILVER PARTY'S PLATFORM.

THE silverites, in their preliminary convention at Washington on Thursday, adopted a preliminary platform with several preambles, one of which recites that the demonetization of silver in 1873 caused a fall in the prices of all kinds of property "except in peculiarly favored localities." It proceeds to say that "such fall of prices has destroyed the profits of legitimate industry, injuring the producer for the benefit of the non-producer, increasing the burden of the debtor, and swelling the gains of the creditor, paralyzing the productive energies of the American people, relegating to idleness vast numbers of willing workers, sending the shadows of despair into the home of the honest toiler, filling the land with tramps and paupers, and building up colossal fortunes at the money centres." In connection with this misstatement of the causes of the present stringency we call attention also to another, which Senator Sherman had the hardihood to make in his debate with Senator Teller on Wednesday. The subject under debate was the pending sale of bonds, and Mr. Teller remarked, with perfect simplicity and perfect truth: "You are not selling bonds to meet deficiencies [of revenue]. You are selling bonds to accumulate gold." To which Mr. Sherman replied:

"If there was no deficiency, there would be no demand for gold. For fourteen years that $100,000,000 of gold stood there in the Treasury, a standard of credit, and no one approached it or diminished it. But the moment the deficiencies occur, then they say they sell the bonds to keep the gold reserve good; but it is to meet the deficiencies, because to meet the deficiencies they take the gold."

It is very convenient for Mr. Sherman to overlook the operation of the act of July 14, 1890, otherwise called the Sherman act, which added nearly $200,000,000 to the fiat money of the country, and alarmed the public on both sides of the water to such an extent that they began to withdraw capital from this country, and continued to do so until the panic of 1893 occurred and it became necessary to repeal that fatal measure. The operation of the Sherman act was coincident with a deficiency of revenue, but it was itself a cause contributing to the deficiency, because it required the purchase of 4,500,000 ounces of silver bullion each month, or more than twice as much as had been required before. The purchases were made in a deceitful, or at all events misleading, way. The Government paid for the silver with Treasury notes; but as the notes were redeemable on demand in gold, it might as well have paid gold directly for the silver bullion so bought. As a matter of fact, the exports of gold from the country during the time the Sherman act was in operation were just about equal to the emission of Treasury notes. The author of the act in question has reasons enough for ignoring that feature of the panic of 1893 and the subsequent misery; but the business men who were ruined by it, and the multitudes who were thrown out of employment in consequence of it, have too many reasons to remember it.

Senator Aldrich, too, was harping on the gold reserve and the fact that it never fell below $100,000,000 until the present Administration came into power. Mr. Teller was quite well aware of this. Mr. Aldrich explained, further, that there were fluctuations up and down, but never,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

until this fatal Administration came in, did it fall below the sum mentioned. Then this colloquy ensued:

"Mr. Teller—That is a fact which everybody understands. We did not break into the reserve of $100,000,000 until after the present Administration came into power. To be fair, I am bound to say that I have not the slightest doubt but that we should have broken into it if Mr. Harrison had been reëlected. It was not the Democratic party that came into power that made it; it was the condition of the country.

"Mr. Sherman—It was a Democratic law.

"Mr. Teller—It was not a Democratic law. There was not any law and had not been any law. That was long after."

The law that Mr. Sherman referred to was the Wilson tariff, which was not passed until July, 1894, whereas the gold reserve fell below $100,000,000 in April, 1893, or fifteen months earlier. Every day we have fresh evidence that Mr. Sherman is losing his wits. Senator Aldrich, however, is not in his dotage. He knows perfectly well that President Harrison's Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Charles Foster, in his last annual report (December, 1892), predicted an early decline of the gold reserve below the $100,000,000 line, saying:

"One of the embarrassments to the Treasury, in the opinion of the Secretary, is the inability, with the limited amount of cash on hand above the $100,000,000 reserve, to keep up a sufficient gold supply. When the demand comes for the exportation of gold, the Treasury is called upon to furnish it. If this demand should prove to be as large the coming year *as it has been for the past two years*, gold in the Treasury would be diminished to or below the reserve line."

But to return to the silverites, the condition of trade and industry which they bewail in their platform is mainly their own work. They caused the Sherman act to be passed. Its consequences were an alarm in the public mind and a withdrawal of capital from the country. When a scarcity of capital began to be noticed, they said that it was caused by the demonetization of silver which had taken place twenty years earlier. They overlooked the years of prosperity that had intervened. They ignored the fact that an era of great business activity began in 1879, when specie payments were resumed, and continued with slight interruptions until the Sherman act was passed, and until its operation had had a marked effect in the expulsion of gold from the country. Then they said the evil dated back to 1873, and many of them believe so now.

It is perhaps hopeless to reason with people who go back to ancient history to find the cause of troubles that their own immediate misconduct has brought upon them; yet he must be a very ignorant man who cannot see that a withdrawal of capital from the country is an adequate cause of all the evils complained of. Every one of these evils is explainable by the single phrase "lack of capital." This will define and describe not only the general badness of trade, but the badness of every individual's trade, his want of profit, or his loss of employment. It is immaterial whether the capital withdrawn is native or foreign. It is immaterial whether the owners of it are Americans or Europeans. Nor is it of any importance whether the motive impelling them to withdraw their money is fear of a change of the money standard or a war scare. The effect is the same. Bad trade, scarcity of money, higher rates of interest, curtailment of loans must follow, and when they come, some leatherhead who has done all in his power to drive capital away by threatening us with the silver standard or with a foreign war, declares that the "money power" is producing all the misery by "cornering gold." First tell every man who has a dollar that you are going to fix things so that it will be worth only fifty cents, and when he takes it to a place where you cannot work this transformation, accuse him of maliciously causing a scarcity of money. O Liberty, how many sins are committed in thy name!

THE ARMENIAN RESOLUTIONS.

THERE has been more debating in the House and Senate over the Armenian resolutions than there was over the Venezuelan correspondence, but no more real taking of counsel. The discussion in the House on Monday had the aerial character which usually marks the fiery utterances of young men's debating clubs. Where else but in the proceedings of such a body would one find it solemnly resolved that "it was an imperative duty, in the interests of humanity, to express an earnest hope" that somebody else would behave properly? What other body would order the Secretary to send this resolution to six first-class Powers as an encouragement to execute one of their own treaties to which we are no more a party than the Y. M. C. A.? We may imagine the hilarity with which it will be received in the various European chancelleries, and the mock solemnity with which its receipt will be acknowledged. We doubt whether it is worth while to notice that the resolutions abandon that part of the Monroe Doctrine which denies our right "to take part in the wars of European Powers in matters relating to themselves"; also Secretary Olney's recent interpretation of the Doctrine, which shuts us out from "wars or preparations of wars with whose causes or results we have no direct concern," and which closes with the remark:

"If all Europe were to suddenly fly to arms over the fate of Turkey, would it not be preposterous that any American state should find itself inextricably involved in the miseries and burdens of the contest? If it were, it would prove to be a partnership in the cost and losses of the struggle, but not in any ensuing benefits."

In fact it would not be easy to make up, by inference, a more complete repudiation of our doctrine of non-interference in European matters, as the complement of the non-interference of Europe in ours.

The new revised Doctrine now is, that we may interfere in European affairs when we see the European Powers plainly neglecting their duty to each other, or when in any part of Europe "the hand of fanaticism and lawless violence" seems to us too strong, or when "men and Christians" in any part of Europe seem to us to be deprived of due legal protection. But surely we ought not to refuse this sympathy to "men and Jews," and yet we have never threatened Russia for expelling her Jewish population under circumstances of great cruelty. Lastly, how are we to assert this right to look after the manner in which European Powers discharge their domestic duties, without granting them the right to pass resolutions and address exhortations to us about our negligences and failures—about our mob law, for instance, as expressed in the unpunished murder of the Italians in the jail in New Orleans a few years ago; in the massacre of the Chinamen in Wyoming; in the numerous, continued, and horrible lynchings all over the country? Are we prepared to accept meekly resolutions of reprobation on these topics from the British Parliament, and the Reichstag, and the Russian Chancellery, and the retort courteous from the Sultan? We doubt it greatly, and yet the probability that we shall have to put up with it, on principles of reciprocity, was never mentioned in the debate.

This vain talk was followed, as usual, by a stern resolve to "stand behind" the President in "the most vigorous action he may take for the protection and security of American citizens" in Turkey. What would or could "our most vigorous action" be? The whole of our fleet put together would not be more than sufficient to force its way up to Constantinople, if all the Powers agreed to stand aside and let it be done. Some of our ships would be sunk in the process. The others would arrive in a dilapidated condition. Both banks of the Bosphorus would be in possession of the enemy, and that enemy a hostile and fanatical population, which fights Christians with great fierceness. Without a land force, where would our coal and supplies come from, and how would the ships get back again after the Turks had time to prepare for their return? Suppose the Sultan, under threat of bombardment, were to agree to restore order in Armenia, how would this benefit the Armenians? They are hundreds of miles away from Constantinople, and they are being massacred by local Mussulmans who pay no attention to the Sultan's orders. *The Sultan has already made to the Powers all the promises which we could possibly extract from him by any action, however vigorous*, without helping the Armenians in the smallest degree. Moreover, there is no proof that we have received any injury from the Sultan, except the destruction of property, and for this, according to all accounts, he is willing to pay.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If we were talking to practical men of business, or serious diplomatists, and not mere Jingoes, we should point out that there are only two ways in which we can do anything for the Armenians. One is to threaten Russia with war if she, the only Power which can act promptly and effectively in the matter, does not occupy Armenia and restore order. The other is to offer to support Great Britain in any measures she may take to carry out the Treaty of Berlin. She has undoubtedly been checked in her recent attempt to coerce the Sultan by the fear that she might find herself acting alone or in the face of a powerful opposition, for she is not a general favorite, and France wants Egypt, and Russia Constantinople. But such support, to be really effective, would involve the despatch to the Mediterranean of a powerful naval squadron and say 50,000 men of a land force. We have little doubt, speaking under naval and military correction, that this, with the troops which England could assemble from England and India, would carry everything before it in Asia Minor, and that the spectacle of the two great Anglo-Saxon Powers acting together, not for aggrandizement but for order and civilization, would be one of the finest the modern world has seen. But, Jingo brethren, it would involve the abandonment of the sacred Doctrine of "the immortal Monroe," and it would commit you to the cares and responsibilities and dangers of European politics, and—harder than all—it would compel you to be civil to the odious "Britishers." If you are not ready for something of this sort, the less you vapor and threaten, the more the civilized world will respect you.

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT IN JAPAN.

TOKYO, December 28, 1895.

THE course of affairs in Japan since the treaty of peace with China has been on the whole different from what might have been expected six months ago. The immediate effect of the peace upon the foreign relations of Japan has been comparatively slight. Not even the Corean troubles have proved to be so fruitful of immediate consequences as seemed likely at first. With Russia and other countries her relations, at least for the present, have assumed all the smoothness and cordiality of the period before the war. Nor is it likely that in the near future this status will be disturbed. So many terrific contingencies lie concealed in the present situation that no government, however eager for success or expansion, will dare to rouse them.

The reflex action, however, of the war and its train of circumstances has given a most distinct impulse to the internal political development of Japan. It will be remembered that party politics in this country has always been in a state of confusion. At least three parties have existed between whom it is not easy to distinguish any essential political principle. All have been against the Government, all have been opposed to the Satcho combination, all have advocated a strong foreign policy, all have stood for the revision of treaties, for the reform of local government, for the expansion of commerce, and for a large number of equally desirable objects. But while these parties have had so many objects in common, their attitude toward each other, except when a common enemy was to be attacked, has been anything but friendly. Each party has occupied its time either in attacking the Government or in denouncing the opposing parties.

A new step has lately been taken, however, which promises to put both the Government and the parties in a somewhat different position. It may be fairly said that no party in Japan can have much chance for success that is not opposed to the Satcho and strongly in favor of responsible party cabinets. The answer that the various statesmen in power, and especially Marquis (formerly Count) Ito have made to all demands for popular governments, is that the ministers are responsible not to the Parliament but to the Crown. The weakness of the argument, however, has been apparent probably even to the present premier. He must be aware that, under present circumstances, it is not the Emperor who summons a new cabinet when the old resigns, but a few statesmen who form an oligarchical faction in the state. Nevertheless, the means of fighting this system of government, powerful in its resources, ability, and past record, have not been within reach of the popular parties, and up to the present time all parliamentary warfare has attacked it in vain.

Early in November a rumor spread of a reconciliation between the Radical or Liberal party (Jiyuto) and Marquis Ito. It was stated that the party leaders of the Jiyuto had approached the premier with a view to harmonizing the differences which had so long separated the representatives in Parliament and the Government. Among all the statesmen of national reputation who have in recent years held the reins of Government, the Liberals could not have approached a more tractable man than the present premier. Of a compromising disposition, by nature disinclined to continual bickerings between the Parliament and Government, he has doubtless come to the conclusion, especially since the close of the war, that the old measure of dissolving Parliament was no longer practicable. Japan is certain to have a serious time of it in the next few years, even under the most favorable circumstances; and with an irreconcilable political system the danger of successfully working the Government and guiding the country through its difficulties would be immensely increased. Whatever the motives actuating him may have been, it is known that Ito did not long hesitate to accept the proposals of the Jiyuto. The latter agreed to support the Government in the next parliamentary session, and thus, for the first time since the adoption of the Constitution, the Government is to have an avowed supporter among the representatives of the people in the lower house.

The Kaishinto and other enemies of the Jiyuto interpret this political alliance in a most unfavorable sense. Their principal charge is that the Jiyuto, long deprived of the rewards of office, have at last fallen a victim to the wiles and bribes of the Government. In this and other ways the Opposition are trying to discredit the Liberals in the country. But it is doubtful whether these charges will have much effect. Most of the local political associations have cordially supported the action of the representatives of the party, and two or three members who have tried to play a double game by carrying on negotiations with the Opposition in case the alliance of their party with the Government proved unpopular, have been promptly expelled from the ranks of the Liberal party. Whatever faults may be attributed to the Jiyuto, it can scarcely be said that they are double-faced, or ambitious for Government posts beyond the usual human measure. Their leader, Count Itagaki, has been called a political dreamer, a theorist; but no one has ever charged him with being other than a singularly honest and upright man. It is hard to say how far he controls the action of his party—in some cases his advice is certainly not accepted; but in the present instance it is almost certain that he wholly approves of the step taken by his party. His assurance on this point is almost a guarantee that the coalition between the Government and the Jiyuto is free from any political bargaining or personal gain to the leaders of the party.

Two motives are mentioned by the Liberals themselves for the coalition. The first of these is the obvious one that the Government work can be immensely expedited by the loyal support of a strong popular party in the lower house. Hitherto the Jiyuto, though at times it has given the Government a grudging adherence, has for the most part joined in the cry against the Government. But for this refusal of the party several years ago to vote any bills introduced by the ministers, the position of the Government would have been immensely stronger than it was in the late war. More than once measures to increase the army and navy, especially the latter, failed to pass because of the implacable temper of the popular representatives towards any measure bearing the Government stamp. It is generally agreed, both by the Japanese themselves and by foreigners who are in a position to know, that had the Government succeeded in putting the navy in the state of efficiency it proposed four years ago—had the Japanese navy, for instance, had two first-class battle-ships—the Japanese would have been at Pekin six months before the war actually ended. That the Government was so bitterly opposed by the various parties was one of the reasons why the Chinese were so eager for war, and why they were so confident of victory in the beginning of the struggle. Hereafter the Government is less likely to be placed in this predicament. As one of the spokesmen of the Jiyuto declared in a speech some days ago, "It does not require any uncommon intelligence to see that nothing could be more disastrous to the interests and dignity of the Empire than that the people should be engrossed in petty party disputes and contentions among themselves."

Another reason which the Jiyuto assign for their action is the influence their coalition with the Government will have in promoting true party government. Naturally their opponents, who are themselves aiming to introduce government by party, ridicule this assertion of the Liberals. It is declared to be absurd on its face that any party can give its support on this ground to what is not a national but a clan government. Yet, in spite of an apparent self-contradiction, there is no doubt that the Jiyuto have a strong case in this contention. Hitherto the Government has stood aloof from all parties. It has claimed to be the impartial arbiter between the conflicting demands of the popular representatives. To whatever extent *in fact* the Government may not have acted up to this assumption, yet it logically could present a strong front so long as it did not deviate grossly from this self-imposed rôle. But hereafter the cabinet ministers cannot fairly claim to be independent of party demands, for the simple reason that they

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have openly admitted a definite party to support them. If they fail to get sufficient votes from their friends, it is difficult to see how they can continue in power. Marquis Ito must have understood this contingency from the moment he agreed to receive the Jiyuto as a Government party. Probably he even acted deliberately in this matter, believing that the time had come when the country would no longer brook the present Satcho administration. To quote another of the spokesmen of the Liberals in a recent speech:

"It is our conviction that, by taking this step (*i. e.*, coalition with the Government), we shall effectually promote the introduction of a system of responsible cabinets—a consummation which has ever been the cherished hope of the Liberal party. For the attainment of that hope we have suffered much, but the sole result of our endeavor has hitherto been to strengthen the Government's resistance to the realization of our object. To continue the fruitless struggle at the present juncture would be not only to thwart the carrying out of various measures of paramount importance, but also to retard the attainment of our long-cherished object. We are confident of victory in the coming session of the Diet. But, should we be defeated, we should be ready to hand over the government of the country to our opponents, if they faithfully represent the sentiments of the people."

A last and most important point for consideration is how far the Jiyuto can give effectual support to the Government in the coming session. If the party had a clear majority over all other parties in the lower house, there would be little difficulty, either for the Government or for the Liberals. But the latter cannot claim more than 109 or 110 party representatives out of a total number of 300. The Progressionists, who are the most active opponents of the Government, claim fifty-three, and the National Unionists thirty-two; while the Independents, together with other minor political organizations, make up the remainder. It is conceded that the Jiyuto can count upon at least twenty or twenty-five of the independent vote, while the Kaishinto claim as many as seventy or seventy-five. From these figures it follows that the National Unionists, with a following of only thirty-two, hold the balance of power between the two larger parties. The Progressionists have made strenuous efforts to get this party to join them in opposing the Government, but so far without success. The National Unionists have little sympathy with the statesmen now in power; on the contrary, they are hostile to both the compromising temper and the personnel of the present cabinet. But they are backed by the military classes of the empire, and cannot join with a party eager to antagonize the Government even in its military and naval policy. Hence the National Unionists are on the horns of a dilemma from which they cannot at present find any escape. Common rumor has it that they will vote with the Opposition on condition that the latter agree to the necessary military and naval bills.

Under the circumstances the present Government is not in a position of security. It will probably be authorized to carry out large designs for the country's welfare, but by the same authority it will be declared unfit for the purpose of carrying on the administration. Should the Jiyuto and their friends have the requisite number of votes to save the Government from the attacks of the Opposition, the present cabinet will be more certain of its position than it has been for a number of years. But the opposing parties are already gathering their strength for an address to the throne, in which the whole policy of the Government will be censured. If this succeeds in passing the House, the cabinet must necessarily dissolve the present Parliament and make an appeal to the country. If a hostile majority is returned, no other escape seems possible but for the present ministers to hand in their resignations. Even if a friendly majority should be returned, the Government will stand committed, and thus in either case party government would be an accomplished fact in Japan. G. D.

TASMANIA.

HOBART, November 26, 1895.

TASMANIA, somewhat smaller than Ireland, is the least in size, though not the least interesting, of the Australasian colonies. Most of its surface is mountainous and rocky and is not likely ever to be brought under cultivation. There are twenty-one mountain peaks 3,000 to 4,000 feet high, eighteen 4,000 to 5,000, and two slightly over 5,000. Unless where cleared, and with exception of the mountains over 3,000 feet in altitude, it is covered with forests constituted principally of different species of eucalyptus. There are coal mines; and gold, silver, and tin are being discovered in considerable quantities in the northern districts. Fruit farming is becoming a considerable industry. After ninety-one years' settlement, the population is but 155,000; less than one-third of the surface has been alienated, and but four per cent. thereof has been brought under cultivation.

It is practically an independent State, having an ambassador, under the name of an agent-general, in London, and, under the ægis of the British Empire, is relieved from the necessity of maintaining an army and navy. Its upper house consists of eighteen, its lower of thirty-seven members—the one elected by a somewhat restricted and partly educational, the other by a general, franchise. The public debt has, within the last few years, largely under labor and sectional influences, been run up from £3,200,000 to £7,600,000. It now stands at £50 per head of the population, nearly twice the national debt of the United Kingdom. But then it has large effects to show, mainly in railways—not merely prestige, honor, and glory, as with us at home. These state-owned and state-worked single-track railways cover 476 miles, and, beyond working expenses, return little over one per cent. on capital. The main roads are excellently maintained, also by the state. The fiscal policy of the country is, under the plea of revenue requirements, mildly protective. To a certain extent, but in a lesser degree than her sister colonies, Tasmania is passing through a wave of commercial depression, consequent upon inflated dealings and engagement in unproductive works upon borrowed capital. "She has," to use a nautical term, "been brought up with a round turn," and artisans recruited from country districts and drawn from other countries have had to look for work elsewhere. The severe lesson is being learned that if there are born more sons and daughters than the country can, by a natural process of expansion, support, it is wiser that they should follow naturally expanding industries abroad than that they should, at the cost of others, find occupations at home by building up unnatural trade barriers. Cheap ocean transit has worked radical changes. Wheat land has gone out of cultivation, and ruins are to be met both of water and of wind-mills.

It was a delightful change from the heat and bustle and wide extent of Melbourne and from the low-lying shores of Port Phillip, to find ourselves, after a sea voyage of twelve hours, steaming up the beautiful, winding, thickly wooded shores of the Tamar. Launceston, with a population of 17,000, is pleasantly situated thirty miles up this river. A railway connects with the capital Hobart, of 25,000, on the Derwent, at the south of the island. Both these are regularly laid-out, quiet cities, with more of an Old World air about them than others we have seen in the southern hemisphere. The line connecting Launceston and Hobart may be said to roughly divide the country into two-thirds and one-third. The two-thirds portion, lying to the west, is for the most part mountain, lake, and waste; that to the east comprises most of the settled districts. The mountainous character of the country is expressed in the Tasmanian railway time-tables, which give, in addition to the ordinary information, columns showing the height of the stopping-places above the sea. The main line between Launceston and Hobart attains an elevation of 1,400 feet. We never travelled on such a tortuous line apparently without sufficient cause. The explanation afforded is that it was constructed for a lump sum by a British firm which acted in the double capacity of engineers and contractors, and to which cheapness of construction, without regard to the future cost of working, was the main consideration.

On the more than one hundred miles of smooth waters of D'Entrecasteaux Channel, Derwent estuary and river, and Norfolk Bay, there is some really fine and much charming scenery. The eucalyptus forests at a distance appear somewhat sombre and uninviting; but, once in their leafy depths, a world of delight is opened up to the traveller. We spent many days lingering by the lakes and exploring the recesses of their ferny valleys. Now, in spring, the undergrowth of shrub and heath is bright with blossom; the air, redolent with scents, is fresh and pure; the coloring of the young trees is varied in different tints of green. To one subjected for long years to the storm and stress of public affairs there is a feeling of almost intoxicating delight in these leafy primeval shades. Fine strands are to be found on the shores of the Tasman peninsula and on the east coast—strands where the pellucid waters of the Pacific break on long reaches of sand, upon curiously formed terraces of basalt, against noble forest-crowned cliffs and promontories. Upon Maria Island, which we reached by a four-hours' crossing in an open boat, from Spring Bay, we found magnificent scenery. Ten miles long by an average width of five miles, clothed in forest and thick scrub, it is the abode of countless numbers of a small species of kangaroo. There are only two families residing upon it, amid the ruins of a former penal settlement and of extensive works connected with abandoned speculations in the direction of vine-culture and cement manufacture.

We have been most favorably impressed by the Tasmanians. There is, outside the towns, where there continue to be amusing gradations, much of that equality of class feeling and simplicity of dress and natural dignity of bearing to be met with in Switzerland, combined with perhaps gentler manners bred of a milder climate. We found travelling cheap and dealings open and fair. Drink-shops are neither many in number nor intrusive in appearance, and we have seen no drunkenness. Through several weeks of railway, coach, boat, steamer, and pedestrian travel, often glad to put up at simple inns where accommodation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was not always of the best, we have heard neither coarse nor even harsh language.

In the history of this interesting country there has been much of the tragic. Upon a small scale, but seldom elsewhere in a greater degree, have the horrors of the impact of civilized with uncivilized man been here illustrated. Seven or eight thousand aborigines inhabited the islands when it was settled in the early years of the century. Sunk in a low condition of barbarism, they went unclothed. But all competent authorities agree in testifying that they were endowed with many good qualities, and were capable, if fairly treated, of living harmless upon the borders of civilization. The desires of successive early governments that this should be, were frustrated by the intolerable outrages inflicted upon the aborigines by escaped convicts and semi-barbarous whites. The aborigines, unable to discriminate, made reprisals alike upon the peaceful settler and the murderous bushranger. The Government felt itself driven into a war of capture or extermination. The few who survived, taken by force or decoyed by false promises, were deported to the islands in Bass's Straits. Changes in modes of life, drink, disease, and neglect soon did their work. A miserable remnant were brought back to a settlement near Hobart. The last full-blooded native, a woman, passed away twenty years ago. Her skull, along with the bones of other extinct Tasmanian mammals, is preserved in the Hobart museum. A few half-castes live on the islands, where they make a living by curing fish and *mutton-birds*.

Tasmania was settled by the United Kingdom mainly as a penal colony. Here were deported alike hardened offenders as well as persons, of both sexes and often of tender years, who had committed offences for which now a few days', or at most a few weeks', imprisonment might be considered sufficient punishment. The wretched Irish peasantry, driven to outrage and violence under the iron heel of class and landlord rule, contributed in no small number to this latter class. Here settled down, after the Napoleonic wars, many British officers, who received grants of land upon easy terms. Among other advantages held out to these and other free settlers was the assignment to them of convict labor. The missionary labors of James Backhouse and George W. Walker have left the marks of Quakerism upon the society of the island. The convict system was here extended as it became apparent that it could not be maintained in the other colonies. Upon the Tasmanian Peninsula, at Macquarie Harbor, at Maria Island, and at Norfolk Island, a far-away dependency, the system was carried out in its concrete and severest form, unmitigated by the safeguards of a numerous surrounding free population. Escape was all but impossible: there was nothing available for the support of life in the forests. There are authentic instances of cannibalism among parties who did make the attempt. Chain-gangs were subjected to the severest labor in swamp and forest, cutting and deporting timber and mining coal. The lash was freely used. To the gallows were constantly consigned victims. Suicide, even among convict children, was not uncommon. A case caught our eyes in an old Hobart paper of a clergyman magistrate sitting alone on the bench, sentencing an unfortunate to thirty lashes and three years in a chain-gang for altering an order for sixpence into one for two shillings and sixpence. This system has long been swept away—all save the remembrance, and ruined walls and vacant barracks, and open cells once impervious to light and sound, where men graduated for the madhouse or were done to death. The forest grows in upon them, and the lizards creep over them. "Such of us as were not bad were made bad," remarked to us an aged survivor of the system. At Port Arthur, a locality almost rivalling Killarney in beauty, we, the other day, rowed across to a lovely island where, in unmarked graves, lie 1,600 convicts. This system has found its 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' in Marcus Clarke's 'For the Term of his Natural Life,' a book the name of which is here in every one's mouth. Those who have lived through the scenes therein described, assure us that while they never could all have occurred in the experience of one connected set of characters, they are based on truth and have occurred "one hundred times over." By the upper classes here, many of whom have sprung from "old hands," everything is done to erase the memory of those times. Records have been destroyed, the names of places altered, conversation upon the subject is discouraged. Among the people the system is with loathing freely spoken of, and the escapes and adventures of Martin Cash and other outlaws give interest to many a locality and form the subject of many a story. To Irishmen, Port Arthur, Maria Island, Lake Sorell, Bothwell, and other localities will ever be associated with the names of W. Smith O'Brien, Mitchel, Martin, Meagher, and their compatriots, the exiles of 1848. There are sad and bitter memories connected with the history of Tasmania, but fortunately their continuity has been completely broken. In a certain sense Tasmania is the Ireland of the Australasian colonies, for the most enterprising and vigorous of her sons are likely, for a long time to come, to find wider scope for the exercise of their abilities abroad than at home. But this arises from natural and economic conditions. She is mistress of her own resources and of her own destiny, and has doubtless a happy future before her.

D. B.

Correspondence.

SECRETARY SEWARD AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: You early called attention to the fact that

"in the negotiations for the only application of the Monroe Doctrine to Spanish-American affairs which we have ever made—the expulsion of the French from Mexico—there was no mention of the Monroe Doctrine at all. . . . Mr. Seward said he did not undertake to dictate to the Mexican people what kind of government they should have. They might have Maximilian if they pleased, but they must be free to choose; and therefore the French troops should be withdrawn."

Mr. Seward not only felt himself not bound by the Monroe Doctrine, but on several occasions expressly repudiated it, being justified by a resolution of the House of Representatives, passed in 1825 (when the matter was *fresh*), which was surely intended to be a correct interpretation of the Doctrine. It reads as follows:

"That the United States ought not to become a party with the Spanish-American republics, or either of them, to any joint declaration for the purpose of preventing interference by any of the European Powers with their independence or form of government, or to any compact *for the purpose of preventing colonization upon the continents of America;* but that the people of the United States should be left free to act in any crisis in such manner as their feelings of friendship towards those republics and as their own honor and policy at the time dictate."

In other words, the United States should not be fettered by any doctrine or programme (no true statesman ever acted on a doctrine or dogma), but were to be left free to act as occasion might require. Mr. Calhoun, one of the advisers of Mr. Monroe, who had taken most interest in the declaration, speaking of the Monroe Doctrine in the debate about the acquisition of Yucatan, asserted most emphatically that the United States was under no pledge to intervene against intervention, but was to act in each case as policy and justice required (see note 36, p. 97, Wheaton's 'International Law,' Dana's edition).

A resolution introduced by Mr. Clay, January, 1824, in the House of Representatives, "deprecating European combinations to resubjugate the independent American States of Spanish origin, and thus giving support and emphasis to the declaration in the message of December 2, 1823," seems never to have been acted upon, and was not referred to any committee.

Now what were the views of Mr. Seward when France had invaded Mexico in 1862? In a dispatch (October 9, 1863) to Mr. Motley, the American Minister at Vienna, who had expressed great alarm at the expedition of Maximilian, and sought instructions as to asking the Emperor of Austria for explanations in allowing recruiting for Maximilian's army to go on in his states, and had referred Mr. Seward to the Monroe Doctrine, Mr. Seward instructed him not to interfere, using these remarkable words:

"France has invaded Mexico, and war exists between the two countries. The United States hold in regard to those two states and their conflict the same principles as they hold in relation to all other nations and their mutual wars. They have neither a right nor any disposition to interfere by force in the internal affairs of Mexico, whether to establish or maintain a republican or even a domestic Government there, or to overthrow an imperial or foreign one, if Mexico shall choose to establish or accept it."

Mr. Seward sent copies of this dispatch to our ministers at Paris, Madrid, and Brussels, undoubtedly for the purpose of advising the Governments to which they were accredited of his views. But, even before that dispatch to Mr. Motley, the writer of these lines was made acquainted with Mr. Seward's views regarding the Monroe Doctrine, by a dispatch received by him in April, 1863. The French expedition was very unpopular in Spain, and just at that time the Madrid press was full of articles denouncing bitterly the policy of Louis Napoleon. In an entirely unofficial and friendly conversation with Marshal Serrano, Minister of Foreign Affairs, we spoke about the Mexican trouble, and in the course of our talk I mentioned that the present events were quite parallel with those happening in 1823, and that I thought that the Monroe Doctrine would be quite applicable. Serrano did not seem to know much about this doctrine, which I explained to him. In reporting my official conversation with the Foreign Minister to Mr. Seward, I also spoke of our unofficial one, mentioning that I had brought the Monroe Doctrine to the recollection of Marshal Serrano. It was not long before I received a dispatch from Mr. Seward, that the President had approved of what I had discussed with Marshal Serrano officially, but he regretted to have to say that the President had by no means approved of what I had to say in relation to the Monroe Doctrine, and that he desired me to at once call upon Marshal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Serrano and assure him that what I had said regarding the Doctrine was only my private view, and did not express that of my Government. Before, however, I received this dispatch, the ministry of which Serrano had been a member was dismissed. I at once had concluded, on reading the dispatch, that it was not written for me, but for the French Government, and so I dropped the matter; and, sure enough, I found in the diplomatic correspondence of 1863, published by the State Department, in a dispatch from Mr. Washburn, our Minister to Paris, the following passage: "I read your dispatch, No. 51, to Mr. Koerner, our Minister at Madrid, to Mr. Drouyn de Lhuys (Minister of Foreign Affairs), and he expressed his extreme satisfaction with it."

Let me add that Mr. Calhoun has been reported to have said that when the draft of Mr. Monroe's message was laid before the Cabinet for consideration, it did not contain the colonization clause; that that passage was inserted by Mr. Adams, and had never been considered and approved by the Cabinet. The fact that this clause occurs early in the message, and is followed by much other matter before the non-intervention passage is reached, lends great probability to Mr. Calhoun's remarks, as certainly those two subjects in the message logically would belong together.

In conclusion, I desire to make another point. Great stress has been laid of late on the fact that the English Government received the message of Mr. Monroe with very great satisfaction—that the Liberal press rejoiced at it; and we are favored with extracts to that effect from English journals of that time. This is all very true, for it conformed to the views of the English Government; but it is equally true that Mr. Canning remarked to Mr. Rush, our Minister at the Court of St. James's, that he was very much displeased with the colonization clauses as being built on false premises; that the southern part of the continent was not settled by Christian nations, so as to exclude all further European colonization, but was the abode of roaming savages. Such countries had always been considered as a field for civilized colonization. In some of his speeches he expressed his dissatisfaction with that part of the message, while he enthusiastically approved of the non-intervention clause. That the other great Powers of Europe which had just planned intervention do not accept the Monroe Doctrine as binding upon them needs no proof. GUSTAV KOERNER.

BELLEVILLE, ILL., January 20, 1896.

JINGO HISTORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In Mr. Cabot Lodge's late speech on the Venezuelan question are some statements that should not go unchallenged:

(1.) Speaking of the bill for the military occupation of Yucatan, to prevent its becoming a British colony, he says: "The war in Yucatan came to an end, and the bill never reached a vote."

Mr. Polk (1848) sent a message to Congress stating that Yucatan had declared its independence of Mexico, and had offered the sovereignty of the country either to the United States or to England; he further stated that the Indians there were conducting a destructive war against the whites, and he declared that the occupation of Yucatan by England would be an infringement of the Monroe Doctrine and that we should resist it. Our army was then in Mexico, and there was no more necessity for an act of Congress to authorize it to protect the inhabitants from Indians than to storm Chapultepec. As the debate in the Senate shows, the real object of the message was to prevent England from occupying the country. When Mr. Hannegan saw the bill would be beaten, he let himself down easy by moving its postponement; alleging the very inadequate reason that the *Indians had stopped killing the white people.* Mr. Calhoun, John Davis (Senator from Massachusetts), and others denied that the Monroe Doctrine had any application to the case. Mr. Niles said there was no evidence that the designs of England had been abandoned, if they ever existed; the argument of humanity had been given up - the argument of policy remained. The appeal to humanity was a mere makeshift, and was not made an issue in the debate.

(2.) Mr. Lodge says of the Monroe Doctrine that "Mr. Calhoun is the only American statesman of any standing who has tried to limit its scope."

If he will read Mr. Adams's messages explaining the object of the Panama mission, and the debates in Congress upon it, he will see that all of the statesmen of that day repudiate the construction now put upon Mr. Monroe's declaration by Mr. Lodge. In his 'Life of Webster,' speaking of his speech on the Panama mission, Mr. Lodge says: "He made a full and final exposition of the intent of the Monroe Doctrine." True, he did make a full exposition of it, and he gave it the same limited scope and interpretation that Mr. Calhoun did in his Yucatan speech. It was not final, however, for Mr. Lodge has given an entirely different exposition of it. Both say that there is no general rule as to the circumstances that will justify armed intervention in the conflicts of other nations. Both Calhoun and Webster say that nothing but manifest, imminent danger can justify such interference. Mr. Webster thought that if a European armament were sent against Chili and took possession of the country, it would not be a *casus belli* with us because Chili is so distant, but that it would be different, by reason of its proximity, if it landed in Cuba. Mr. Calhoun said the same thing. Mr. Lodge says if England takes a strip of land in Venezuela to which the United States thinks she is not entitled, it would justify war. It is all the same to him whether she is near or far away.

(3.) Mr. Lodge quotes the two declarations of Mr. Monroe's message and joins them together, as if they related to the same subject-matter. He thereby perverts and distorts Mr. Monroe's meaning and creates a false impression. If read in connection with their context, it will be seen that they relate to entirely different subjects—one to the designs of the Holy Alliance in Spanish America, the other to the negotiation then pending with Russia about the Northwest (Oregon) Territory. It is supposed by many that Mr. Monroe said that the United States *would not permit* any European Power to colonize on either of these continents. He said nothing of the kind. He did say that there was no longer any territory *subject* to colonization by a European Power. Now, as Mr. Adams's correspondence with the American Minister to Russia, and his special messages to Congress explanatory of the objects of the Panama mission, and Mr. Clay's dispatch to Mr. Poinsett, show, the declaration simply meant that the whole eminent domain of the two continents had become vested in independent civilized nations, and was no longer subject to colonization by right of prior discovery and occupation. But this would not exclude the right of acquisition by treaty or conquest.

(4.) Mr. Lodge says that slavery was the cause of the failure of the Panama Congress. It may have inspired some of the opposition to the mission; it had nothing to do with its failure. Bolivar had put the same interpretation on the Monroe message that Mr. Lodge does, viz., that it implied a promise of a defensive alliance and protectorate over Spanish America. Hence the United States were invited to participate in the Congress. The disavowal of any such purpose by the friends of the mission in the United States destroyed the illusion. The South American deputies never attended it; the American ministers went and found nothing but yellow fever and mosquitoes. One of them died. The mission was an abortion.

JNO. S. MOSBY.

SAN FRANCISCO, January 16, 1896.

AMERICAN HATRED OF ENGLAND.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your editorial on American hatred of England omits two or three factors. One of these is the influence of the school histories in use a generation and more ago. Every one of these books that I read in my youth was pervaded with a distinct anti-British animus. The conduct of Great Britain in the Revolutionary war and the war of 1812 was placed in an odious light. It cannot be said that they were incorrect; but when the facts were presented without reference to the civilization of the times, the inevitable conviction produced in our minds was that every British soldier was a fiend of a peculiarly malignant type, and that every British officer was his abettor. When the antipathy thus engendered had somewhat subsided, the attitude of the English ruling class towards the North, and their outspoken sympathy with the South in the late rebellion, did much to kindle it afresh.

Again, Irish influence in this country is a perennial instigation to our hatred of the English. Nobody need be told what a powerful factor the Irish-Americans are in our politics, and five-sixths of them are animated by the most intense animosity against the English Government and the English people. How far this animosity is justifiable it does not here concern us to inquire—the fact is patent to the most superficial observer. There is, I imagine, hardly a community in any of the Northern States in which the Irish are not making an active propaganda of hatred against the English both by lectures and by newspapers. As our sympathies are always with the injured party, the effect of this crusade of words is easy to predict. As the defence is but feebly represented, or not at all, the resulting mental state of our public would be easy to imagine even if we did not see it. CHAS. W. SUPER.

JANUARY 20, 1896.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Might I suggest, as an additional reason for the hatred of England in the United States, the Englishman's habit of giving his critical faculties full sway wherever he goes? He comes to this country for the first time under the impression that he is visiting his nearest relations, and may therefore speak as freely as if he were dealing with things at home. Only time teaches him that Englishmen are foreigners in America, while Americans in England are always Americans—the term "foreigner"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being generally reserved for non-English-speaking peoples.—I am, sincerely yours,

HERBERT SKINNER.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COL., January 20, 1896.

ADAM SMITH ON PROHIBITORY DUTIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In spite of Mr. Rae's care, he has overlooked some interesting letters of Adam Smith. Among them, I think the following is of the highest interest. Much as he had written on bounties and prohibitions, I know of no confession of ignorance so pertinent as his discovery that not a rag of his clothing was on his back legally, but in defiance of the law. I believe this letter has been in print, and on my copy is marked "*Athenæum*, 7 April, 1860"; but it is sufficiently interesting to be again printed. WORTHINGTON C. FORD.

WASHINGTON, January 20, 1896.

ADAM SMITH TO WM. EDEN.

EDINBURGH, 3rd of January, 1780.

DEAR SIR:

It gives me very great pleasure to hear of the success of your letters to Lord Carlisle. I acknowledge I was not a little anxious about the success of a pamphlet which abused no party and no person, and which represented the state of public affairs as less desperate than it is commonly believed to be. The nation, I hope, is coming both into better humour and better spirits than I believed it to be. Besides the editions you mention, your letters have gone through an edition even in this narrow country.

I do not know how to thank you for the very honourable mention you have made of me. It does not occur to me that much can be added to what you have already said. The difficulty of inventing new taxes, or increasing the old, is, I apprehend, the principal cause of our embarrassment. Besides a strict attention to economy, there appears to me to be three very obvious methods by which the public revenue can be increased without laying any new burthen upon the people. The first is a repeal of all bounties upon exportation. These in Scotland and England amount to about 300,000*l.* a year, exclusive of the bounty upon corn, which, in some years, has amounted to a sum equal to all the other bounties. It will probably amount to a very considerable sum this year. When we cannot find taxes to carry on a defensive war, our merchants ought not to complain if we refuse to tax ourselves any longer in order to support a few feeble and languishing branches of their commerce.

The second is a repeal of all prohibitions of importation, whether absolute or circumstantial, and the substitution of moderate and reasonable duties in the room of them. A prohibition can answer no purpose but that of monopoly. No revenue can arise from it but in consequence of its violation and of the forfeiture of the prohibited goods. Instead of encouraging, it commonly prevents the improvement and extension of the branch of industry it is meant to promote. Dutch cured herrings cannot be imported, upon forfeiture of ship and cargo. They are, however, vastly superior to British cured; you can scarce imagine the difference. The price of a barrel of British cured herrings is about a guinea, and that of the Dutch, I imagine, is nearly the same. Instead of the prohibition, lay a tax of half-a-guinea a barrel upon Dutch herrings. Dutch herrings, will, in this case, sell in Great Britain at 33*s.* or 34*s.*; a circumstance which will confine them altogether to the tables of the better sort of people. The British curers will immediately endeavour to get this high price, and, by superior care and cleanliness, to raise their goods to an equality with the Dutch, and this emulation will, probably, in five or six years' time, raise the manufacture to a degree of improvement which at present I despair of its attaining to in fifty or sixty years. Our fisheries may then rival the Dutch in foreign markets, where at present they cannot come into competition with them, and the manufacture may not only be much improved, but greatly extended. Prohibitions do not prevent the importation of the prohibited goods. They are bought everywhere, in a fair way of trade, by people who are not in the least aware that they are buying them. About a week after I was made a Commissioner of the Customs, upon looking over the list of prohibited goods (which is hung up in every Custom House, and which is well worth your considering), and upon my examining my own wearing apparel, I found, to my great astonishment, that I had scarce a stock, a cravat, a pair of ruffles, or a pocket-handkerchief, which was not prohibited to be worn or used in Great Britain. I wished to set an example, and burnt them all. I will not advise you to examine either your own or Mrs. Eden's apparel or household furniture, lest you be brought into a scrape of the same kind. The sole effect of a prohibition is, to hinder the revenue from profiting by the importation. All those high duties, which make it scarce possible to trade fairly in the goods upon which they are imposed, are equally hurtful to the revenue, and equally favorable to smuggling, as absolute prohibitions. It is difficult to say what such a repeal of all prohibitions, and of such exorbitant duties as are scarce ever fairly paid, might produce. I imagine it would produce a still greater sum than the repeal of all bounties, provided a reasonable tax was always substituted in the room both of the exorbitant tax and of the prohibition.

The third is, a repeal of the prohibition of exporting wool, and a substitution of a pretty high duty in the room of it. The price of wool is now lower than in the time of Edward the Third, because now it is confined to the market of Great Britain, whereas then the market of the world was open to it. The low price of wool tends to debase the quality of the commodity, and may thus hurt the woollen manufacture in one way as much as it may benefit it in another. By this prohibition, besides, the interest of the grower is evidently sacrificed to the interest of the manufacturer. A real tax is laid upon the one for the benefit of the other. In old times a duty upon the exportation of wool was the most important branch of the customs.

I heartily congratulate you upon the unexpected good temper of Ireland. I trust in God that Administration will be wise and steady enough not to disappoint that people in any one thing they have given them reason to expect. Give them as much more as you will, but never throw out a single hint that you wish to give them anything less. Remember me to all friends, and believe me to be, with great esteem and regard, dear sir, most entirely yours,

ADAM SMITH.

CARELESS MAGAZINE WRITING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In *Harper's Magazine* for November, which arrived here yesterday morning, I have just read Julian Ralph's second story of Anglo-Chinese life, entitled "Plumblossom Beebe's Adventures," illustrated by C. D. Weldon. The tale touches the seamy side of life in a Treaty Port, and to the great uninitiated public of America it will probably seem a picturesque and accurate delineation of facts. Julian Ralph is a clever journalist, well practised in taking superficial notes of what he sees, and in holding his pitcher-ear wide open for the yarns he may hear, all with a view to working up literary material of his own. I give him full credit for what he has accomplished, but it is the merest hack-work at best. We have all been laughing at his "pidgin English" out here—we call it Ralphese, for it is nowhere spoken in China as his characters speak it.

Pidgin English is not in the least like "English baby prattle," as Julian Ralph states on page 946 of the magazine. Of course, to a globe-trotter it may sound so for a few days, but as soon as he tries to obtain a serious knowledge of it, he should not fail to see that it is a very valuable compromise between Chinese grammar and phonetics and those of European nations. It is not a haphazard, meaningless 'babble, invented to soothe small children; it has regular rules of construction, and is not left to the individual whim of a globe-trotter.

On the first page of his story Ralph exhausts his smattering of the lingo, and says in excuse, "The pidgin English is too confusing to follow farther." Why did he begin? Let me give the Ralphese and the real pidgin-English of page 942 of the magazine, in parallel columns:

RALPHESE.	PIDGIN-ENGLISH.
"He comes some other side, in countly," said the go-between. "He belong kidnap girl—some man have tief her.* Been tlained singsong girl, but no can do: no gottee good voice. He velly good girl—can plomise† he alle time have been velly good."	"He have come other side countlee. He belong stealum girlee—some tief man catchee he. Have teachee he do sing song girlee pidgin, he no good, no can sing ploper. That girlee heart velly good—can secure he allo time have velly good."
"But she is not alive," said Sam. "No belong girl — belong wooden t'ing. What for she no move no laugh no belong alive girl? Have makee die? My wantschee one-piece gal can makee play-pidgin, makee laugh makee chin-chin."	"He no belong 'live." "No belong girlee—belong one piecee wood. What for he no makee move, no makee laugh, no belong 'live girlee? He have makee die? My wantchee one piecee girlee can makee play, makee laugh, can talkee-talkee."

*Nominative and objective cases are identical in Chinese, therefore in pidgin English. There is only one third-personal pronoun, which in Chinese is "*ta*," translated *he* in English, but in reality masculine or feminine according to context.

†"Plomise" is not pidgin-English but Ralphese. The word is *secure*, pronounced "secuah."

It is high time that the up-to-date journalist abroad were taught not to dabble in what he knows nothing of. On page 946 there is nearly a column of utterly uncalled for vituperation of foreign residents in China as a class. They, however, entertained him hospitably when he was here, filled him with food and drink and his literary knapsack with provender, which he has shamefully wasted. It is not true that we "repeat the silliest and most cruel lies that can be found in books upon China," such, for instance, as "that all Chinese eat dogs and rats, slaughter or sell their girl babies, beat their wives and often kill them, have no hearts, never show affection, never bathe or wash, and so on *ad infinitum*." These statements, it is true, appear in most books about China, because most books about China are written by folk who have spent three or four months in the country.

James Payn's 'By Proxy' is absurd, so far as accuracy is concerned, and so is Hannan's 'A Swallow's Wing'; but both those stories of China, written many years ago, are excellent literature compared with Ralph's realistic romances. Jules Verne's 'Tribulations of a Chinaman' is also superior. D. T.

SHANGHAI, December 19, 1895.

THE EXPLORATION OF CORINTH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Since completing the excavations at the Argive Heraion and at Eretria, the American School at Athens remains without a field for explorations. The Germans are occupied with their work on the supposed site of the ancient agora of Athens; the French are still busy at Delphi; and the English are likely to begin

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

excavations the coming spring on the island of Melos. As yet the explorations of the Americans have not identified themselves with any of the chief centres of ancient Greek life. The work at Assos, Thorikos, Anthedon, Sikyon, Ikaria, Eretria was all of it admirably successful, and yielded results which are of permanent value. The excavations at the Argive Heraion were the most extensive and the most complete of any, and very rich in results, but they involved the exploration of a single cult-site, isolated from the city which names it by a distance of several miles. Though this comes nearest to being a site of first importance of all which the Americans have undertaken to explore, it cannot, of course, rank with the Olympia of the Germans nor the Delphi of the French.

In looking about for a place for further work, Dr. Richardson has been attracted to Corinth. Though the second city in general importance in ancient Greece, practically nothing has as yet been done toward its exploration. The Germans some years ago dug about the foundations of the ancient Doric temple, of which several columns are still standing, sufficiently to determine its ground plan. Nothing whatsoever has been done, however, to fix the topography of the ancient city, nor to locate with certainty even one of the many temples and monuments which Pausanias saw in the agora and its neighborhood. There is not so much as a well-established theory as to even the approximate location of the agora. The theatre, usually the easiest thing to identify among the ruins of an ancient city, has not yet been found, though Pausanias speaks of it twice, and locates it definitely between two temples standing outside and in general to the west or southwest of the agora. The ancient Doric temple mentioned above is frequently called a temple of Athena, but utterly without authority or competent reason. The entire site of this great city, whose walls, according to Strabo, involved a circuit of forty stadia, remains a totally unexplored field. And yet there are abundant evidences that excavations would be rewarded by immediate results. The ancient fountains of which Pausanias makes emphatic mention, and which he treats as landmarks, are still to be seen, together with the colossal aqueducts hewn out of the solid rock which conveyed their water supply. At one place on the vast terrace which probably formed the site for the central part of the city, there can be seen the outlines of the foundations of some great edifice making still a hillock in the midst of a wheat-field; close beside, there protrudes from the earth, as if tempting investigation, a colossal column-drum.

Most of the territory which would invite the first exploration is free from dwellings. The ancient agora lies perhaps partly under a group of shabby huts grouped about an ancient fountain that may well represent the fountain which Pausanias speaks of as being in the agora. The only difficulty which could attend an attempt at excavation would be found in the fact that the land is private property; but, undoubtedly, permission to dig at different points in the fields can be readily obtained sufficiently to make a beginning of the work and to secure the first orientations in the topography. The Greek Government and the local authorities have shown themselves friendly to the undertaking, and seem ready to help in every way.

The only question seems to be the one of ways and means. The school has but $500 available for excavations this year. If it undertakes Corinth, it ought to have $2,000 a year for five years. The German and French Schools depend for such funds upon their respective Governments. We have a better and, I believe, a safer reliance in the generosity and public spirit of our citizens. It is a great opportunity and worthy to be ranked as a national cause.

The address of the treasurer of the School is Mr. Gardiner M. Lane, No. 44 State Street, Boston, Mass. BENJ. IDE WHEELER.

THE AMERICAN SCHOOL,
ATHENS, GREECE, January 8, 1896.

Notes.

AN anonymous reply to Max Nordau, 'Regeneration,' is on the eve of publication by G. P. Putnam's Sons. Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler furnishes an introduction.

Charles Scribner's Sons announce 'Comedies of Courtship,' short stories by Anthony Hope, and 'A Lady of Quality,' in Queen Anne's time, by Mrs. Frances Hodgson Burnett.

Macmillan & Co. will publish Alfred Austin's new poem, 'England's Darling'; 'Social Interpretations of the Principles of Mental Development,' by Prof. J. Mark Baldwin of Princeton; 'An Outline of Psychology,' by Prof. E. B. Titchener of Cornell; and 'An Ethical Movement,' by W. L. Sheldon.

In view of the approaching revival of the Olympic games at Athens, a quarto album, 'Die Olympischen Spiele 776 v. Ch.—1896,' beautifully and copiously illustrated in the text, and edited by Profs. Lambros and Politis and Dr. Christomanos, has been undertaken by the University bookseller in Athens, C. Beck (New York: Lemcke & Buechner). The two parts into which the work is divided deal with ancient and modern athletics respectively.

A second, revised and greatly enlarged edition of Potthast's 'Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke des Europäischen Mittelalters bis 1500' will be issued in August by W. Weber, Berlin (New York: Dyrsen & Pfeiffer). The Roman letter will be used, and the page will be remarkably clear for ready reference. The Bollandist 'Acta Sanctorum,' Bouquet's 'Rerum Gallicarum et Francicarum Scriptores,' the Abbé Migne's 'Patrologie,' the 'Monumenta Germaniæ Historica,' Muratori's collections, etc., are some of the labyrinths threaded by this "pathfinder."

Mrs. Darmesteter's 'Froissart' (Charles Scribner's Sons) is a graceful sketch of a literary life five hundred years ago. By careful study, Froissart's poems along with the chronicles are made to yield the slender thread of narrative, and contemporary illustrations are reproduced. Through the scholarly courtesy of M. Longnon, the author is able to give an account of Froissart's long-lost poetic romance of chivalry, 'Méliador.' This work disappeared in 1440, and nothing was known of it until M. Longnon, by a combination of sagacity and good fortune, unearthed it in the National Library in November, 1893. Mrs. Darmesteter believes that M. Longnon and herself enjoy the singular but hardly enviable distinction of being the only persons in 400 years who have followed its "linked sweetness long drawn out" to the bitter end of its 30,600 lines.

Prof. J. Shield Nicholson has made some additions to his 'Treatise on Money and Essays on Monetary Problems,' in the third edition which now appears (Macmillan). The additions are directed to the further explanation of the "quantity theory" in the light of the great increase of the production of gold and its accumulation in the vaults of the Bank of England. This ought to bring about a higher level of prices, which in Prof. Nicholson's opinion has not been attained because of the continued depreciation of silver. In order to give room for this additional matter, two essays which had little relation to monetary science have been omitted.

In 'Missions and Mission Philanthropy,' by John Goldie (Macmillan), we have an ill-written but suggestive book. The author gives it as his conclusion, after twenty years of charitable work and meditation upon charitable theory, that what he calls "natural philanthropy" (which is philanthropy based on natural law and dispensed by individuals, not organizations) offers the only hope there is for the elevation of the needy poor. All organized charities, he maintains, create more impostors than the worthy they relieve. The philanthropic impulse he finds in general to be too sentimental and subjective, and philanthropists more in need of instruction than the poor. The air of paradox which these contentions wear, together with Mr. Goldie's very untrimmed style and decided weakness in exposition of what he thinks the true theory and practice of philanthropy, will doubtless repel the readers who would most profit by his critical chapters.

Many efforts at elaborate illustration of a volume by a number of associated artists have been made, but few of them have been very successful. The latest of these, 'A London Garland' (Macmillan), is, on the whole, no exception to the rule. We noticed, some weeks ago, the list of distinguished names among the draughtsmen who have contributed to this venture of the London Society of Illustrators, and, as might be expected from them, the volume contains much excellent work; as might also, perhaps, have been expected, it is quite lacking in unity and decorative harmony. The illustrations are not only in many styles and many mediums, but of very various sizes and of different relations (or no relation) to the page. We have here a large etching by Seymour Haden, ruthlessly shorn of margin, and near it a little one by W. L. Wyllie, which is an island in a sea of white paper; a long upright by E. H. New, and an oblong landscape by A. R. Quinton, each more awkwardly placed than the other on the square page; and the extremes of hard precision and vague softness in the drawings of Sandys and of Whistler and Arthur Tomson. The result is interesting, but it is not good book-making. What we like best in the volume is the truly decorative headings designed by Mr. R. Anning Bell.

The December *Portfolio* (Macmillan) is devoted to a monograph on the early Dutch painter and miniaturist, Gerard David, by W. H. James Weale, that artist's discoverer. This monograph is as dry reading as a catalogue, being crammed with little but exact and detailed description of David's works and some discussion of their authenticity. As art criticism it has no existence, but it should prove a useful collection of facts. The illustrations show us in David an interesting artist of about the rank of Van der Weyden.

The third and concluding volume of Dr. Heinrich von Poschinger's 'Fürst Bismarck und die Parlamentärier' (Breslau: Trewendt) consists chiefly of Bismarck's remarks during some twenty sessions of the Imperial Diet and the Prussian Assembly from 1879 to 1890. The last sixty-three pages contain addenda to the second volume, the results of recent researches touching the career of the German statesman from 1847 to 1879. There is a full index of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proper names and another of topics to all three volumes.

The last volume of Brockhaus's 'Konversations-Lexikon' has just appeared, completing the fourteenth edition, which is published in celebration of the hundredth anniversary of the Lexikon. The encyclopædia of one hundred years ago, with its six small volumes without illustration, has grown to sixteen volumes, each of which is twice as large as those of the first edition, making the whole thirty-two times as large as the original. The present edition is in every sense up to the times, and the efforts of the publishers and the four hundred contributors have made it a monument to German scholarship and art. It contains more than 126,000 articles, about 10,000 illustrations in the text and on 980 inserts, and 300 maps and charts. Throughout the work special attention has been given to Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Switzerland. Among the most interesting articles of the last volume may be mentioned "Vereinigte-Staaten," with five maps, "Uebersicht des Weltverkehrs," "Vierwaldstättersee," and "Wien," with several maps and inserts.

Meyer's 'Nürnberger Faustgeschichten' is the publication of several stories which were recently found by Mr. Meyer in a manuscript of the library at Karlsruhe. This manuscript was prepared by the Nuremberg schoolmaster Rosshirt, who died in 1586, and it contains some Faust stories which Rosshirt wrote, according to the Nuremberg tradition, and which give us an insight into the manner in which the Faust saga developed from the death of Faust (1540) to the publication of the first *Faustbuch* (1587). Especially attractive is the story of how Faust, while lecturing at the university in Ingolstadt, took several of his companions on a journey through the air to the wedding of the King of England. There is also a new version of the events just before Faust's descent into hell. In these stories Faust has the given name Georg, as in the case of some of the earlier traditions. By way of introduction, Mr. Meyer reviews the history of the historical Dr. Faust and of the older Faust traditions, in which he brings out many points entirely new or heretofore not sufficiently emphasized.

The first parts of an illustrated history of Swedish literature by H. Schück and K. Warburg have recently appeared in Stockholm. The general treatment is similar to that of Koenig's German and P. Hansen's Danish work. A special feature is the division of the labor between the two authors; Prof. Schück, who contributed the article on early Swedish literature to Paul's 'Grundriss,' treating of the periods before 1718, and Prof. Warburg, who is the author of an excellent short history of Swedish literature besides a number of critical biographies, having charge of the periods since 1718. The names of the authors are a sufficient guarantee that this work will be not mere compilation, but a real contribution to Swedish thought.

Mme. Edgar Quinet, in 'La France Idéale' (Paris: Calmann Lévy), has set a worthy example of conjugal devotion and of love of country. Her high regard for the opinions of her husband (who died twenty years ago, at the age of seventy-two) is shown on nearly every page, if now and then to the disparagement of other men of letters (as Fustel de Coulanges and Renan). The tone of the essays is moralizing throughout, serious but in the main hopeful, liberal as to political and religious matters; and reminds one in various ways of the "Immortel Absent" from whom the writer draws so much of her inspiration. In spite of several strange incongruities and inconsistencies, the author's evident desire to contribute to the moral elevation of the growing generation in France is likely to be fulfilled by this book.

Readers and students at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris have rather a gloomy outlook before them in respect of the new catalogue. They have just been told that they will be very lucky if the year 1900 finds them in possession of it. For more than twenty-five years the whole force at the library has been engaged in this enormous work. The subject-catalogues have already been finished; the present question is, in what way these should be fused into a whole. Unhappily there has been much disagreement among the librarians on this point. It was determined at last, more than a year ago, to appoint a commission of eminent men of letters and of science, to whom should be submitted all the different plans, and the documents were placed in its hands. No report has yet been made by this commission, for the simple but somewhat astonishing reason that it has not as yet held a single meeting.

Among the new periodicals of the new year we remark *American Resorts*, published at No. 59 Dearborn Street, Chicago, on the 15th of each month, with abundant illustrations; and, in quite another vein, *Terrestrial Magnetism*, an international quarterly journal emanating from the Ryerson Physical Laboratory of the University of Chicago. All languages capable of being printed in the Roman letter will be admitted. No journal of the kind is now in existence.

In the current number of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* Mr. Edward W. James has another slave-holding census to exhibit, for Abingdon Parish, Gloucester Co., Va., April, 1786. The largest number of slaves held by a single owner was 160, and 143 and 116 are also recorded. For 98 owners there were 1,151 slaves. We notice also an account of a judicial burning of a female slave for poisoning her master, in Orange Co., Va., in 1745; and a list of Virginia portraits by St.-Mémin in the Corcoran Art Gallery at Washington.

Africa is the absorbing topic in the *Scottish Geographical Magazine* for January. Mr. H. S. Cowper gives an account of a recent journey in Tripoli made for the purpose of examining the remains of its ancient megalithic temples. In a comparatively small district he discovered nearly sixty sites, and learned of the existence of numerous others. The oldest structures are trilithonic in shape, the only monuments now standing which parallel them being the great trilithons of Stonehenge. The suggestion is made that they are "the work of Libyan races largely influenced by contact with the arts and crafts of Phœnician civilization." There is also a description of Ashantee and the Gold Coast, and an interesting notice of Hausaland by the Rev. C. H. Robinson, who states that the Hausa language is spoken by fifteen millions of people, and is one of the four great languages of the continent. Although this race is superior, both intellectually and physically, to all other natives of Equatorial Africa, there is no place in the world "where slavery and slave-raiding are being carried on on so large a scale." This assertion is borne out by the writer's observations during a journey through the country in 1894. "In the course of our march from Kano to Bida, we passed so many towns and villages that we ceased to keep count of them, all of which had been recently destroyed, their inhabitants having been sold as slaves, and this not by any foreign invader, but by the chief in whose territory the places themselves were situated." To Kano, the Manchester of Central Africa, come two million people annually, chiefly for the cotton clothing woven there, and which is to be bought even in the Mediterranean ports.

The *Mouvement Géographique* publishes an interesting letter by M. Wauters giving an account of the new house which was disinterred at Pompeii last December. M. Wauters considers this house to be the most important of all that have been exhumed. The atrium and the peristyle, the mural paintings, the statuettes on their pedestals, and the marble furnishings are perfectly preserved. The peristyle is the chief and most interesting part. The interior court is remarkably large; its portico is decorated by eighteen fine Corinthian columns, supporting an ornamented cornice, which is almost intact. The walls are painted in black and red. Between the columns are set nine magnificent basins of white marble, four tables on chimeras' feet, and nine statuettes representing Bacchuses, Fauns, and Loves, holding geese. The mural painting of the principal room shows a charming frieze of little Loves engaged, some in striking medals, others in glass or coral work, and others still in pouring libations or driving chariots drawn by antelopes. The Directory of the ruins has determined to leave all these objects in place, and not to send them, as is usually done, to the museum at Naples.

The opening article in *Petermann's Mitteilungen* for December consists of notes by Dr. Philippson on his map of the Peloponnesus, showing the cultivated land, vineyards, orchards, gardens, forests, underbrush, meadows, and deserts. He draws rather a melancholy picture of the increasing sterility of the land through the cutting down of the forests and the destruction of the small growth. The map, though drawn from observations made only from six to eight years ago, does not represent present conditions. The cause, for which he can suggest no practical remedy, arises chiefly from the exclusive use of charcoal as fuel, and from the great number of goats kept by the peasantry. Prof. Ruge describes the monumental work published by the Italian Government commemorative of Columbus. It is in six parts in fourteen volumes, the last being a bibliography of all Italian works on Columbus and America. There is also the usual interesting survey of geographical literature for the past year. The number of works important enough to be noticed was 870, a little over a hundred more than last year; the chief gain being in works about Europe. America and Africa also show considerable gains, while there is a surprising falling off in works on Asia. A supplemental number is devoted to an account of a journey by Dr. Radde in the summer of 1894 in Daghestan on the northern slopes of the Caucasus. From it we learn that the recently built railroad connecting the Russian system with the Caspian at Petrovsk had not at that time developed the business which had been confidently expected from it. The new oil wells of Grosny were also proving something of a disappointment, though the daily shipment by rail was said to be over half a million pounds of crude petroleum.

The latest university to open its doors to women is the University of Athens. Five women were enrolled for the winter term, yet not without violent objection from some of the students. It was with difficulty, we learn from the *Academische Revue* of December, that the authorities could restore order. The question divided the students into hostile parties, and two of them went from words to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blows, until finally one shot the other with a revolver at the entrance to the chemical lecture-room. Strange conjunction of the barbarism of the East and of the West at a temple of science in Athens!

The last monthly summary of the 'Finance, Commerce, and Immigration of the United States' (Nov., 1895, corrected to Jan. 10, 1896) contains, in addition to the usual statistical matter, a large diagram of our foreign commerce for the years 1791–1895. The items given for each year are: the domestic exports and the total imports (with a per-capita summary for 1795–1895 by decades), the imports free of duty, and the imports and exports of gold and of silver. The choice of a larger scale for presenting imports and exports of the precious metals than that used for presenting general exports and imports on the same chart is unfortunate. It does all that an appeal to the eye can do to emphasize the mischievous notion that exports of gold were somehow a matter of relatively greater importance, even before 1890, than were exports of pork or of cotton. For the rest, the diagram is admirably clear.

—A movement is now on foot at the University of Cambridge in favor of admitting duly qualified women to degrees. It is felt that so long as women are without status in the University, they lose the moral support which the University is able to give; that, without the dignity of the degree, intellectual efforts directed towards it are discouraged; and that all the benefits which the University has in its power to bestow upon education and learning should be made freely accessible to all students. A series of joint meetings between the Girton Executive Committee, a committee of the Council of Newnham, and certain resident members of the Senate have been held recently, and, as a result, a memorial has been agreed upon "requesting the Council of the Senate to nominate a Syndicate to consider on what conditions and with what restrictions, if any, women should be admitted to Degrees in the University." This memorial is now in circulation among the members of the Senate and has received many signatures. The meetings were presided over by Dr. Henry Sidgwick, Knightsbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University, and by Dr. Peile, the Master of Christ's College, who are guiding the movement. The success of the women students at both Oxford and Cambridge makes the question of admitting them to degrees daily more pressing, and, with a like agitation going on at this time at Oxford, the prospects of full University membership for women in England are brightening. Logically, there is but one solution of this problem—to admit women to degrees; but whether the fulness of time has arrived, it remains for this well organized and ably conducted effort to determine.

—In a book of a hundred pages, 'Social Changes in England in the Sixteenth Century, as reflected in Contemporary Literature: Part I., Rural Changes,' Prof. E. P. Cheyney has collected and arranged the material to be found in contemporary literature for the history of the agrarian revolution in Tudor England. This monograph, one of the publications of the University of Pennsylvania, issued by Ginn & Co., would, perhaps, have presented a more scholarly appearance if its author had made more clear to his readers the extent to which he builds on the works of previous writers, and if he had explained more explicitly the character of his own contribution. And even if he did not deem it wise to enter into a discussion of the very difficult legal questions raised by the eviction of the customary tenants, it would have been well to indicate what the problems are which still remain for solution. But the collection of passages he has here brought together and printed, mostly in full, will be very handy for the student of economic history. It certainly shows that but little more light on the subject is to be expected from the study of Tudor literature. Mr. Cheyney has reaped that field pretty thoroughly; later gleanings are not likely to add much to our knowledge, and we must now turn to "sources" of another kind. The student of literature also—to whom, perhaps, the monograph more particularly appeals—will be thankful to get so clear and untechnical an account of a movement which vitally affected the life and thought of the English people.

—A French scholar of eminence, a really erudite critic, M. H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, member of the Institute and of many learned societies, makes a somewhat remarkable confession in a recent number of the *Revue Critique*. He says that he had often heard tell of Freeman, and many times had read in the English reviews high praise of his qualities as an historian, but that not one single word of his had ever come before his eyes until, happening by chance one day to be at the office of the *Revue Critique*, he saw lying on the table the first volume of the 'History of Sicily,' by the great English writer. This was not the original text, but the German translation published last year at Leipzig by Teubner. M. d'Arbois opened the volume and ran through some pages of it, and was "ravi par le talent de l'auteur, qui, chose extraordinaire, était à la fois un érudit et un grand historien." And so he asked the editor to intrust the volume to him for review, and carried it away with him. Mingled with the pleasure that he found in his new acquaintance, he found in himself also a certain sense of shame that he had not sooner known so remarkable a work, and that he was reading for the first time—in a German translation published at Leipzig in 1895—a book which had appeared at Oxford in 1891, and which covered, in part, ground which he himself had traversed in various studies and writings. A visit to the library of the Institute and to that of the University brought him some slight, but rather sad, consolation. He found in each the 'History of Sicily' in English, but the two publics which frequent these libraries had been as remiss in the study of Freeman as he himself. At both, the volumes were intact: not a leaf had been cut. This is a story which one word of comment would mar; but one may permit himself to imagine what would be said of an English or American scholar who confessed entire ignorance of any French writer who could be considered anything like Freeman's equivalent. With all the gain in patient work, and the accuracy that comes from patient work, which French scholars and writers have shown during the past five-and-twenty years, it is still Candide's maxim that they follow most. They cultivate their garden, but without looking over its hedge very much; and they seem not so conscious as it would be wise to be of its true breadth and length.

—A recent discovery made by the distinguished physicist, Prof. Wilhelm Conrad Röntgen of the University of Würzburg, is now exciting considerable interest in Germany, where it is being subjected to a thorough examination by scientific men. By means of the rays proceeding from Crookes's radiometer under the influence of electrical induction, Prof. Röntgen succeeded in photographing on ordinary photographic plates. These rays which are wholly imperceptible to the eye, and the existence of which has been hitherto unsuspected, have the power of penetrating all kinds of wood and other organic substances and solid bodies, except metals and bones, which are alone capable of resisting them. Thus the photograph of a wooden box in which iron weights are enclosed, shows only the iron weights; the box leaves no impression whatever on the photographic plate, the electric rays passing through it just as the ordinary rays of light pass through the air or any perfectly transparent object. The same is true of flesh. A photograph of the hand or the leg shows only the bones; the photograph of a man, whether clothed or naked, is merely a human skeleton with a watch or a ring, if he happens to wear them. Neither his clothing nor his flesh offers the slightest resistance to the rays, which are also unaffected by sunlight, so that the photographic process can be carried on anywhere in the daytime. The importance of this discovery in its application to surgery as an aid to diagnosis in cases of disease or fracture of the bones is apparent. The photograph would reveal immediately and unmistakably the nature of the disorder without the long and often painful examination which the patient is now obliged to undergo. In a case of complicated fractures another photograph can be taken after the bones have been set, in order to ascertain whether the dislocation has been properly reduced or the broken parts have been rightly replaced. The exact position of a bullet or the splinter of shell can also be easily found without the use of a surgeon's probe. In all probability the process can be perfected and modified so as to photograph the heart, lungs, liver, and other internal organs, and thus determine their precise condition; at present, however, these organs offer no resistance to the rays, and therefore leave no impression on the plate. Some months ago Prof. Röntgen read a paper on this subject entitled, "Über eine neue Art von Strahlen," and printed in the proceedings (*Sitzungsberichte*) of the Würzburg Physikalische Medicinische Gesellschaft. This report has now been issued in pamphlet form by the university publisher, Stahel, in Würzburg.

—A striking periodical, entitled *Biographische Blaetter*, edited by Dr. Anton Bettelheim of Vienna and published by Ernst Hofmann & Co. in Berlin (New York: Lemcke & Buechner), has just completed the first year of its existence. It is a quarterly magazine of 130 octavo pages, dealing with the art, or, as we must henceforth call it, science, of biography, its methods of inquiry, its raw material, and its literary form. The list of associates who have pledged Dr. Bettelheim their permanent support contains many of the best-known names among the historians and literary men of Germany, and gives to the work an assurance of substantial value. The prospectus groups the subject-matter under four general heads: (1) treatises on the theory and historical development of biography and autobiography, with critical analyses of the methods pursued by the great masters of biographical writing; (2) biographical and autobiographical studies and essays; (3) confessions derived from unprinted or not easily accessible sources, in so far as they serve to illustrate the history of civilization and man-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ners (*Culturgeschichte*); (4) biographical miscellanies, necrologies, and a full bibliography of current publications relating to biography and autobiography, together with short reviews of the most important works. From the first three numbers, which are now before us, we may form some estimate of the value and scope of the undertaking, and it is much to be able to state that the rich promise of the ambitious prospectus is in large measure fulfilled. The enterprise seems to have had its origin in the conviction that the art of writing biographies, hitherto practised in all the irresponsible confidence of ignorance by any henchman of letters, should be scientifically formulated, and the laws of biographical technique be defined and established. With this purpose in view, Dr. Ludwig Stein of Berne has discussed in a tentative and modest way the "Methodenlehre der Biographik." Limitations of space forbid us to go into detail concerning other excellent articles. Of special interest to the English reader are the personal recollections of the Anglo-German artist, Rudolf Lehmann, who relates what he saw of men so widely separated in their walks of life as Liszt, Sir William Siemens, Pius IX., and Robert Browning. But to the student the most valuable, and henceforth indispensable, feature is the extensive biographical bibliography. This on the German and the Spanish side is particularly full, and it is to be hoped that the other literatures will be taken up in due course.

—The third section of Konrad Miller's 'Die Ältesten Weltkarten' (Stuttgart: Roth; New York: Lemcke & Büchner) covers the smaller maps of the Middle Ages, dating before the circumnavigation of Africa and the exploration of the Western Atlantic. The reproductions are some in sketches, others in photographic representations, and a few are in colored delineations on folded sheets. Most of them are already more or less familiar to such as have access to the atlases of Santarem, Lelewel, and Kretschmer; but they are nowhere else so systematically arranged together. Miller has a further advantage over most of the earlier editors in that he has availed himself of the exactness of the camera, though it must be confessed that the photographic reproductions of such old maps are a sore trial to all but the expert in the deciphering of names and legends. Dr. Miller does all that could be hoped for in aiding the student in this respect, and his collation of the inscriptions gives a distinctive character to his work for completeness and accuracy. Most of his originals are found in different copies, almost wholly as illustrative adjuncts of manuscript treatises, which are scattered over Europe in the larger libraries. While the author enumerates these various copies, as a rule, he commonly selects but one of each kind for his annotations. The series begins with a map from a Saint Jerome MS. of the fourth century in the British Museum. For the next century we have the type of discs used by Macrobius; for the sixth, those fashioned after the Cosmas figure. Beginning with the tenth century the specimens are more frequent. We find them annexed to psalters, like one of the thirteenth century in the British Museum; to encyclopædic treatises, like that of Canon Lambert of the twelfth century; to chronicles, like those of Matthew of Paris (thirteenth century) and Higden of Chester (fourteenth century); and, among various other sources, to codices of Sallust. The only one which Miller gives that has any direct interest for the student of the age of exploration westward from Europe is the map of Andrea Bianco, of 1436, which has long been perhaps the most familiar of the entire series.

—The impetus given to the study of the Italian dialects by Ascoli and the foundation of the *Archivio Glottologico* has resulted in a long series of works most creditable to Italian scholarship. A recent publication belonging to this class may be briefly mentioned here, especially as it possesses a more general literary interest than usual. The popular sacred drama has always flourished in Italy, and it is one of the few countries in Europe where it still survives. How extensive these survivals are may be seen in the second edition of D'Ancona's 'Origini del teatro italiano.' These popular sacred plays are, however, rapidly dying out everywhere, and must be collected at once if collected at all. One of the few relics of the Piedmontese popular sacred drama has been rescued from oblivion by Rodolfo Renier in a volume before us, entitled, 'Il "Gelindo," drama sacro piemontese della Natività di Cristo' (Turin: Carlo Clausen). This play on the subject of the Nativity probably originated in the seventeenth century, and has since undergone many changes to suit it to the taste and dialect of the various places in which it was performed. The body of the play (which is made up of the legend of Ara coeli, the adoration of the shepherds, the adoration of the Magi, and the slaughter of the Innocents) is in Italian, but the seven shepherds and shepherdesses use the dialect of Upper Montferrat. It is well known that in the mediæval sacred drama a large place was allotted to the comic element. In the present play there was no opportunity for it except with the shepherds, who are represented as typical Piedmontese peasants carried back eighteen centuries into the miraculous life of Palestine. It is with the dialect of these characters that the editor deals in sixty-seven pages of *illustrazione linguistica*, treating phonetics, morphology, syntax, and lexicography in the most approved scientific manner. This is counterbalanced by a literary disquisition on the popularity of the play (which takes its name from one of the shepherds who has become proverbial in Piedmont), its performance (it is still acted every winter), various versions, chronology, and sources. Incidentally the representation of the Nativity in Art is touched upon, and the book closes with an appendix on the relics of the popular sacred drama in Piedmont. The whole work is marked by the fine scholarship which distinguishes recent Italian work in the fields of philology and literary history.

ENGLISH'S CONQUEST OF THE NORTHWEST.

Conquest of the Country Northwest of the River Ohio, 1778-1783, and Life of General George Rogers Clark, etc. By William Hayden English, President Indiana Historical Society. Indianapolis, Ind., and Kansas City, Mo.: The Bowen-Merrill Company. 1896. 2 vols., royal 8vo, pp. 1,186, more than 125 illustrations.

THE "Northwest" is a fugitive term of widely varying connotation at different times. The American Northwest has receded to Alaska since Revolutionary times, when it first acquired political definition in the style of the "Territory of the U. S. N. W. of the River Ohio," as on the seal of July 13, 1787—that great region which in due course became Ohio, 1803; Indiana, 1816; Illinois, 1818; Michigan, 1837; Wisconsin, 1848; and a part of Minnesota, 1858. Across *la belle rivière* in those days was the Virginian county of Kentucky. On both sides of the same stream was George Rogers Clark, conqueror of the Northwest and founder of Louisville, hero of that great drama whose dénouement nearly doubled the area of the United States. The exploit was unprecedented, and has been but once repeated in that magnificent stroke by which Jefferson redoubled the United States from the Mississippi to the Pacific. The conquest of the Northwest of 1778-'83 is only another name for the life and times of Clark, who first finds his adequate biographer in the author of this great work. The materials were copious; their richness was almost embarrassing; and Mr. English has utilized them all to the utmost advantage. The result is a noble historical and biographical work of permanent value, which at once takes first rank. The story is told with precision and in great detail; it abounds in contemporaneous documentary material of the highest value, and is enriched with a great many facsimiles of letters and autographs, besides portraits, views, maps, and other illustrations.

George Rogers Clark was born November 19, 1752, on Rivanna River in Albemarle County, Va. We have much of his ancestry and early days, introducing us at once to the style of the author's narration—biography and history in minute detail, necessarily somewhat discursive and even diffuse in working up such a mass of materials, but always returning to the main thread after each digression. The famous Illinois campaign was authorized by Patrick Henry, Governor of Virginia, January 2, 1778. His private instructions are given in facsimile, together with the long and eagerly sought letter of the Privy Council of next day, signed by G. Wythe, G. Mason, and Th. Jefferson. The falls of the Ohio to which Clark repaired existed, of course; but Louisville did not. With the opening of the campaign there we are told not a little about the Bowmans, especially Major Joseph, who died August 14, 1779, of injuries received at the capture of Vincennes; of the Harrods, and many other local worthies. Clark wanted 500 men, but mustered only some 150. He reached the falls about May 27, 1778, and camped on Corn Island to organize his force; the small guard he left there became the germ of Louisville. Four of his captains were already Bowman, Helm, Harrod, and Montgomery; Ruddell, Lynn, and others were there added. There were some desertions when his destination was made known. Reckoning 35 or 40 additions, and 10 left as a guard, he prepared to move with about 175 men, and his very weakness spurred him to take desperate chances. He embarked June 24, at the moment of the nearly total eclipse of the sun of 1778, reached Fort Massac in four days, and went overland to Kaskaskia, July 4. The town and fort were captured without firing a gun, and Philip Rochblave made prisoner; Fort Gage became Fort Clark; Simon Kenton appears on the scene, and so does the patriotic priest Pierre Gibault.

Clark then sent a force under Bowman to "Parra de Rushi" (Prairie du Rocher, near the celebrated Fort Chartres); to St. "Phillips" (Philippe); to "Cohos" or "Cauhow" (Cahokia), whose fort became Fort Bowman on its capture. The whole line of posts and settlements along the Mississippi thus fell into his hands. At the time of this invasion of the Illinois country, Col. Henry Hamilton was Lieutenant-Governor at Detroit—the "hair-buyer general," as Clark called him—who be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

came the most odious and detested of all the British officers concerned in these operations. The news of the rebel invasion reached him August 8; he left Detroit October 7, with men said to have been 179 in number, went down the river, across the lake, up the Maumee to "Ome" (Indian village "aux Miamis," site of Fort Wayne), over to the "Ouabache" (Wabash), and so on to Fort Sackville in seventy-two days. This was the important Post St. Vincents, in the present Vincennes, Ind., which Clark had meanwhile garrisoned with a detachment under Capt. Helm, then reduced to twenty-one men, while Hamilton's force had increased to several hundred British, French, and Indians. Helm surrendered with honors of war December 17, and Hamilton held the fort.

Rochblave, the last of his Majesty's commanders in the Illinois, had been sent captive to Virginia August 4. The Governor communicated the news of Clark's successes to the delegates in Congress November 16, and that body voted a resolution of thanks November 23, to which Clark replied March 10, 1779. Virginia promptly organized the "County of Illinois," under John Todd, December 12, 1778; Gov. Henry also wrote to Clark the same day, and again January 1, 1779, but Clark does not seem to have been advised of these communications February 3, when he reported the whole situation to the Governor, and outlined his proposed Vincennes campaign; for, as he said, "we must either quit the country or attack Mr. Hamilton."

At Kaskaskia, Clark had but a few more than one hundred men, and could not have moved but for assistance from Francis Vigo (1747–1836), who furnished the sinews of war in an amount, $8,616, which became with interest over $149,898 when finally settled in 1875. On February 4, 1779, the *Willing* dropped down from Kaskaskia with forty-six men, under Lieut. Rogers: the land force was of four or five companies, in all about 170 men. The latter left next day under Clark, by the trail sometimes styled the "Appian Way of Illinois," en route to Vincennes, via present Sparta, Coultersville, Oakdale, Nashville, Walnut Hill, Salem, Maysville, and Lawrenceville, a distance of some 160 to 170 miles, then called 240. The Wabash was crossed just below the mouth of Embarras River February 21, and Clark was on the heights back of Vincennes on the evening of the 23d, after a terrible march, in part over country flooded with icy waters.

It is disputed whether the fort which Clark took is of 1713, named for one Jean Sacqueville, or 1769, for a Lord Sackville; there may easily have been two of different dates, with similar names. The one captured stood on the east bank of the Wabash, between that and First Street, and between Vigo and Baronet Streets, at the foot of Church Street, close to the St. F. Xavier Church of that time, in present Vincennes, Ind. A night attack was made on the 23d; a peremptory demand for surrender next morning; a truce for three days was rejected, a conference held, and Post St. Vincent capitulated, the garrison marching out on the 25th. Clark changed the name to Fort Patrick Henry. The boat *Willing* arrived two days later. Insignificant as may seem to us now the forces in action, this completed the conquest of the Northwest in a short, spirited, and almost bloodless campaign, fraught with far-reaching consequences of great magnitude. It is sad to be obliged to add that the capture of Vincennes proved to be the culminating point of Clark's career.

Chapter xii. continues with various important events on the Wabash in 1779. The cherished project of a campaign against Detroit was in abeyance, but one important expedition up the Wabash captured seven British boats and about forty men, with supplies intended for Fort Sackville. Bowman was dead. Clark returned to the falls of the Ohio and divided his troops between Vincennes, Cahokia, Kaskaskia, and the falls, by general orders of August 5, 1779, thus establishing possession of the country which had been for ever wrested from the British. The appendix to Volume I. is rich with contemporaneous documents of extreme value, relating to the events just sketched, some of them here appearing for the first time in print, and all being additional to such as we have in the main text. They include, among other letters and reports, Bowman's journal of January-March, 1779; Clark's own diary of December 25, 1776–November 22, 1777; the roll of officers and men captured at Fort Sackville, etc.

Volume II. opens with chapter xiv., pp. 605–663, giving a long and circumstantial account of the captivity in Virginia of Hamilton and other prisoners, harshly treated in retaliation for cruelties to American prisoners in other quarters. By the end of the summer of 1779 the little garrison Clark had left on Corn Island had removed to the mainland on the Kentucky side and built a stockade in present Louisville, probably at the foot of Twelfth Street, thus laying the foundation of the city agreeably with Clark's plans. Meanwhile, Jefferson had succeeded to the governorship of Virginia, June 1, 1778. On September 30, 1779, Clark issued orders for a fort on the Mississippi near the mouth of the Ohio, and Fort Jefferson was built early in 1780, when Clark went with a few men to Iron Banks, in present Bullard County, Ky. The American position was still endangered by Indian hostilities, and insecure by reason of an invasion of the British from Michilimackinac. The latter was repelled by Clark, who made a counter raid from his rendezvous at the mouth of the Licking, on to the old Indian town of Chillicothe, with less than 1,000 men, and attacked Piqua, August 8, 1780. This same autumn De la Balme's expedition, with a few men from Kaskaskia, Cahokia, and Vincennes, against British posts on the lakes, was defeated by the Miami chief Little Turtle, in the vicinity of the present Fort Wayne. Such operations brought up again Clark's long-cherished plan of an expedition against Detroit. Jefferson approved. Clark was made a brigadier, and arrangements were perfected by which he expected to leave Fort Pitt with 2,000 men in June, 1781. But he failed to secure Continental troops, and the failure of 700 others reduced his total force to about 400. He was to have been reinforced by Col. Lochry; but this officer reached Wheeling, August 8, one day after Clark left, and he was cut off by the Indians, who killed or captured his entire force. This was disaster in itself, and it also frustrated the Detroit campaign—probably the most bitter disappointment of Clark's life.

Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown, Va., October 19, 1781. Indian troubles lessened when the natives were no longer instigated or led by the British; the provisional treaty of peace ensued, November 30, 1782; cessation of hostilities was agreed upon at Versailles, January 20, 1783, proclaimed by Congress April 11, concluded at Paris September 3, and ratified January 14, 1784. The cession by Virginia of all her lands northwest of the Ohio was effected March 1, 1784, and the Territory of the Northwest became organized under the ordinance of 1787. The seal bears date of July 13, 1787, with the motto, "Meliorem lapsa locavit." But before the great drama was ended, Clark was ordered off the stage of events. He was relieved of his command July 2, 1783—that is, he was simply dropped. He had never been an officer of the Continental army, and on the necessary reduction of Virginia troops he was thrown out "with thanks," but without the decencies or even the necessaries of life. He retired to Kentucky to neglect, to humiliation, to dire stress of poverty, with the most injurious effect upon his health and morals. At that time the State actually owed him money; fifty years afterward there was judged over $30,000 due the administrators of his estate; it was not till twenty years after his dismissal, and six before his death, when he had become a maimed paralytic, that he was allowed a pension of $400 a year. In 1783 we have the spectacle of the conqueror of the Northwest in Richmond to beg for bread. In 1792 he was still struggling with poverty; a letter written to his brother Jonathan, May 11, 1792, speaks of his account against the State as being "as just as the book we swear by"; and bitter must have been the reflections of one who could then say with truth, "I have given the United States half the territory they possess."

No kindly light ever led Clark on after 1783. In 1786 he was put in command of some operations against Indians which resulted fruitlessly and ignominiously, by open revolt of his men from his authority. He retired to Vincennes, overwhelmed by this fresh disaster; his habits grew worse, and he did things which must have pained his friends then, even as they still make the judicious historian grieve. "Clark is playing hell," was the word on December 12, 1786; and though Jefferson remained his staunch friend, and tried in 1791 to bring him up again, it was impossible to do so. In 1793 Clark made probably the greatest mistake of his life, enabling his enemies to affix a stigma of dishonor and even treason to a name already tarnished by private bad habits. He accepted a commission with the high sounding title of "Major General in the armies of France and Commander-in-chief of the revolutionary legion on the Mississippi River," against the Spanish, in violation of international law and under governmental condemnation. He may never have meditated action against his own country, but any such expedition as he had in view was stopped by act of Congress of June 5, 1794, and proclamation of March 24, 1795, declaring the proposed operations unlawful. Clark's military career closed for ever, under a cloud.

The remainder of this extremely copious and intensely interesting work is largely occupied with minute details of the "Clark Grant," by acts of the Virginia Legislature of January 2, 1781, and of 1783, locating about 149,000 acres of ground for allotment in severalty to the officers and soldiers of the Illinois regiment. The survey of this land by one William Clark brings up the question of the three persons who bore that name, and Mr. English has succeeded in identifying them all. Surveyor William Clark, son of Benjamin Clark, brother of Marston Green Clark, and cousin of George Rogers Clark, deceased November or December, 1791, was not the jurist, William Clark, who died at Vincennes November 11, 1802, nor yet the William Clark of "Lewis and Clark" fame. A facsimile of the patent issued by Edmund Randolph, Governor of Virginia, December 14, 1786, is given, and also another, of the original

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

official plot, certified by Surveyor William Clark, with a roll of the men, sketches of the commissioners, and other biographical data of the greatest possible value. It seems that Gen. G. R. Clark attended the meetings of the board from 1784 to March 14, 1810, the date of his last signature, after he had become paralytic. This grant was the origin of Clarksville, Ind., and various other towns along the Ohio opposite Louisville and thence upward. The old general there dragged out many lonely years, in oblivion and intemperance. He was stricken with paralysis after a drinking-bout, fell in the fire, and so burned one of his legs before recovering consciousness that erysipelas set in and amputation became necessary. This was early in 1809, before the days of anæsthetics, and the grisly old warrior lost his leg to the music of drum and fife, played to distract his attention from the misery of such an operation. One of the most persistent myths which have reached us is that when General Clark was presented with a sword, he cried, "Damn the sword!" etc., or said, "When Virginia needed a sword I gave her one. She sends me now a toy. I want bread." Mr. English's analysis of the traditions shows about as much truth in them as in the still more celebrated story of the "little hatchet" of Washington. General Clark was twice presented with a sword by the Virginia Legislature—June 12, 1779, and February 20, 1812—at which latter date he was placed on the pension list. He died at the house of his sister, Lucy Croghan, at Locust Grove, Ky., February 13, 1818.

Much more than we can possibly outline here is given in estimation of Clark's life and services; sketches of many men who served under him; and a full account of the handsome monument erected at Indianapolis February 25, 1895, mainly through the distinguished author's own efforts to that end. We have also much Clark genealogy, especially full regarding the brothers and sisters of G. R. Clark. The appendix to this volume contains a great variety of interesting matter, including in full Clark's account against the State of Virginia, and the strange history of the bill in chancery over his alleged will, filed May 6, 1835, and not dismissed till November 20, 1865. It also appears that the present work is but an instalment of that which the author has in hand, and we trust sincerely that he will elaborate his other materials in the same fruitful manner.

STEPNIAK'S LAST WORK.

King Stork and King Log: A Study of Modern Russia. By Stepniak. London: Downey & Co.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895.

WHATEVER else can be said about the late Stepniak's writings, it can never be asserted that they are not interesting as to matter and trenchant as to style. The very title of the book before us furnishes a proof, though some readers may question the propriety of calling the late Alexander III. "King Stork," and feel startled at the temerity which can decree to Nicholas II., after a reign of less than a year, the epithet of "King Log." If it is regarded as a valid excuse, in the case of Lord Salisbury, that a new Government inevitably inherits the policy and political debts of its predecessor, and must be allowed time to initiate gradual changes, it certainly is not unreasonable to claim some small measure of the same excuse for the corresponding autocrat in Russia. In fact, our author says in one place: "Alexander III. was not the founder of that system, and cannot be held responsible for it." However, we will defer further consideration of that point until we have made a brief examination of what precedes it.

The fact seems to be, with regard to this book, that it is composed of articles published at various times during the last five years. The internal evidence proves this, but as no direct hint is given of this state of affairs, for the benefit of non-experts, the constant assumption that the whole has been written in the immediate present is frequently misleading to a serious degree; as, for example, when "the present Emperor" stands for Alexander III. instead of the actual occupant of the throne. Stepniak admits that matters change so rapidly in Russia that it is not possible for the revolutionists who live abroad to direct operations; they cannot even understand the conditions from the other side of the border. Consequently, a difference of five years, or even of much less time, plainly renders certain utterances less valuable, when it does not nullify them altogether.

Very few writers are as insidiously persuasive as Stepniak. He has the art of engaging our sympathies, and convincing us of whatever he pleases, unless we chance to be able to pin him down on one incontestable point, and so obtain the proper gauge of confidence which we must give to his arguments and illustrative anecdotes. It is very unfortunate that, in the hastily written first chapter, designed to introduce and bind together the scattered papers which form the book, he should have fallen into the grievous error of telling that anecdote about Count L. N. Tolstoy's drama, "The Dominion of Darkness." Stepniak's "trustworthy source" has furnished him with a very good story, which runs, briefly, to the following effect: Alexander III. read and liked "The Dominion of Darkness." His daughter, Xenia Alexandrovna, who is the wit and literary critic of the family, liked it still more, and she proposed that the play should be privately performed in one of the halls of the Anitchkoff Palace. After the actors had been engaged, and all the arrangements made, Count Dmitry Tolstoy, Minister of the Interior, agreed with the Head Censor that its performance must be prohibited on the ground of its "immorality," and the imperial performance was stopped. When Xenia Alexandrovna mentioned the matter at a family party, at which some of the ministers were present, expressing her surprise, the Czar turned to his ministers and merely exclaimed, with a meek astonishment one does not associate with the idea of an all-powerful despot: "Yes, imagine! the play has been prohibited!" The date of this extraordinary tale is not given, but, as Xenia Alexandrovna was only fourteen years old when Count Dmitry Tolstoy died, in April, 1889, its apocryphal character is plain enough; an American girl would not be allowed to read that play at that age, much less a Russian girl. Thereafter the reader involuntarily questions the accuracy of every emphatic utterance, and all the utterances are emphatic. The anecdote is enlightening in another direction also, namely, as to the author's habit of using all arguments, no matter how contradictory, to assail the object of his dislike. He has already said of Alexander III.: "He had not the masterfulness of his grandfather, Nicholas I., a typical despot, and, unlike his father, he had a great respect for the laws passed by himself. His reign was the most lawless we have had since, perhaps, the time of the adventurers of the eighteenth century"; and then he criticises him for submitting to the law like an orderly person and for an example. The interpretation given to the anecdote about the thanksgiving mass at the Kazan cathedral offers another instance of seeing things in diametrically opposite ways, according as one has a point to prove or is merely a disinterested spectator.

Nevertheless, with all our involuntary doubts, it is of the highest interest to have these clear statements as to important events and measures, as viewed by the revolutionary party. Some of them are, it is true, utterly irreconcilable with everything which has been authoritatively stated hitherto—such as the nature of the document which Alexander II. was on the point of promulgating when he was assassinated. In this connection, it is rather surprising that Stepniak, while mentioning the Princess Dolgoruky-Yurievsky's pamphlet, does not also refer to the answering pamphlet which was written by one of the Court dames, and which might have furnished him with some telling points against the Princess, who misrepresented, as he thinks, his friends and the circumstances. His elucidation of the Slavophile doctrines is very good, and his exposition of the workings of the new District Commanders is extremely useful, and the most complete that is accessible. But why did he not do justice to the Government by stating the reason for the change contained in the appointment of these District Commanders? While no landed proprietor, in anticipation or in practice, approves, unreservedly, of that reform, it is certain that not one proprietor could be found who would not frankly admit that some radical change was necessary, owing to the peasants' abuse of electoral rights. Abuses of the same sort occur even in advanced republics, and it is not always easy to decide upon the best remedy for them under the most favorable circumstances—which is not the proper description for the Russian circumstances, it must be confessed.

"The establishment of the District Commanders is one of the sorest grievances of rural Russia. The emancipation of the serfs was not a great success. Even the partisans of the Government admit that now. It did not improve the material condition of the masses. But the former serfs became citizens; they recovered their personal independence and immunity from interference in their private affairs."

Americans who are conversant with the negro problem at the South will find no difficulty in understanding this.

More difficult to reconcile are such statements as those on pages 119, 120, in regard to the recent great famine, and the Government's efforts to keep it secret. "The editors of the papers received stringent orders not to publish, under the fear of suppression and other administrative penalties, any news about the famine likely to 'disturb the public mind.'" Yet it is asserted that Count L. N. Tolstoy's letter calling upon the Government to state plainly whether or not there was sufficient corn in the country to keep the Russian people until the next harvest, and to provide it, in case there was not, was not only printed but "quoted and endorsed by the whole press," and "Vyshnegradsky found it necessary to give it a reply."

Among the topics with which Stepniak deals is that of the Jews. "The classes which are at the head of the Russian anti-Jewish movement have long ago outlived the period of religious fanaticism," he says.

"With them the hostility towards the Jews is purely racial. With the masses, also, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

racial antipathy is also a much stronger ingredient in the anti-Jewish feeling than religion. Thus we may fairly describe the anti Jewish movement as racial. . . . Everywhere the Jews almost monopolize the most lucrative calling in the community—that of middlemen. They come to constitute a class apart as well as a race apart, and racial hostility comes to embitter the struggle between the classes. . . . In the Pale of Settlement the Jews, although forming but one-seventh of the population, have concentrated in their hands one-half of the wholesale trade of the region, and have almost monopolized the retail trade."

This is the explanation of a friendly writer, it is to be noted. Very curious is the explanation of the anti-Jewish riots. A year before these occurred, the Emperor issued a manifesto denouncing the Nihilists, and calling upon all his faithful subjects to assist the police in exterminating them. The official name for Nihilists is *kramolniki*, which means, in Russian, rebels, state criminals. But in the south of Russia the peddlers and retail traders, who are all Jews, are popularly called *kramorniki*. The illiterate peasants, not unnaturally, got the two words mixed, and believed that the Jews were at the bottom of the trouble. Notwithstanding this, they behaved in a friendly manner, as Stepniak relates, to Jews who had been friendly to them.

Naturally, Stepniak has a good deal to say with regard to the political exiles in Siberia, and his narratives are of the most thrilling sort. But he is not quite just, in many instances; men whose sentences were pronounced in 1874–6 can hardly be regarded as, primarily, oppressed by Alexander III., whose reign dated only from 1881. At one point, also, he speaks of an exile having died at Berezoff, and, immediately afterwards, remarks: "But under Alexander III. it [leniency] was entirely thrown aside, and the practice of exiling people to places utterly unfit for human habitation was introduced on a large scale." Berezoff is included in that category, as recently introduced, whereas it was used as a place of exile in the middle of the last century—for Prince Mentchikoff and for Ostermann, among others. Stepniak's disregard of his country's history does not, of course, mitigate the horrors of Berezoff, but it increases the uninitiated reader's indignation against Alexander III. Another very confusing result of carelessness in writing and proof-reading arises from the different dates assigned to various events: for example, the Emperor Nicholas II.'s wedding manifesto is set down as having been issued on January 26, instead of on November 26, thereby ruining the argument of comparison between it and another manifesto. Again, on p. 170, it is said: "Politically, the speech of December 20 [1894] marks an epoch in the history of our opposition movement." On p. 200 this speech is referred to as having been made on January 20 (1895). We must also allude to the errors which arise from Stepniak's imperfect mastery of the English past tenses of the verbs. Astonishing as was his knowledge of our language, he unwittingly leads the ordinary reader astray by inaccurate use of those tenses.

Among the other topics of vital moment which are here treated are: the situation in Finland and Poland; the character of the Russian peasants, to whom Stepniak pays the high tribute which is their just due, but which they rarely receive from foreign writers; Nihilism, of which he gives the first and best summary, in its strikingly varied phases, from its inception to the present day; and the revolutionary view of Nicholas II., and his brief reign to date. As to the spirit of the latter, it can only be said that the judgment must, of necessity, be superficial and hasty; that it is not softened by even so much as the suggestion that a vast empire cannot be switched to another track in the course of a few months; and that, while the author hotly champions the cause of the peasants, he blames the Emperor for paying too much heed to them as well as for oppressing them. "Relentless, implacable hostility toward the whole of enlightened, educated Russia, and patriarchal benevolence toward the peasants, such is the policy of the new Czar," he says, just as he has violently attacked Alexander III. for being "the Peasant Czar" and upholding the peasants by entirely different methods. In short, it is unjust irrevocably to condemn Nicholas II. as "King Log" for inaction, and Alexander III. as "King Stork," the devourer of his people, when it is plain that no consistent canon of conduct exists even in the mind of the implacable judge who seeks thus to sentence them to eternal opprobrium.

We return, last of all, to our former assertions, that the two volumes are interesting and enthralling to the highest degree, but that we dare not accept them as finally authoritative, either as to concrete statements or as to the general impression produced, after the specimens of inaccuracy which we have selected for illustration.

Chess Sparks. By J. H. Ellis. Longmans, Green & Co. 1895.

Chess Novelties. By H. E. Bird. Frederic Warne & Co. 1895.

In a letter about chess written some years ago, John Ruskin remarked: "I may tell you one thing much in my mind—the possibility of assigning value to games, primarily by the fewness of moves, secondly by the fewness of captures. Exchange games, where, after a hundred and fifty moves, the victor wins by an odd pawn, may contain calculations enough for next year's almanac, but they are quite out of my horizon of chess." Impelled, no doubt, by similar views, Mr. Ellis has made a most fascinating collection of games in which a winning position was attained in twenty moves or less. Many of these games were played by celebrated masters, and are more or less well-known specimens of brilliancy, while others are perhaps more remarkable for brevity than scientific skill. Among the examples of eighteenth-century play is a delightful *giuoco piano* of sixteen moves, won by Jean Jacques Rousseau in 1760 from the Prince de Conti, another proof—if proof were needed—of the versatility of that remarkable intellect. Abundant diagrams make it easy for the reader to follow the more complicated games, and Mr. Ellis has further supplied him with an index of players, a table of solutions, and a chronicle giving the results of all the important chess matches and tournaments from 1824 to 1894. Typographical errors, of the kind so common in chess books, are pleasantly lacking.

This particular merit is not shared by Mr. Bird's book, which contains plenty of instances of K instead of Kt, and even K to Q3 instead of Kt to Q B3. Other merits, however, it certainly possesses. In the first place, the veteran author is an interesting personage in the chess world. As long ago as 1847 he was playing matches with that admirable performer Buckle, the historian. In 1851 he played on even terms with the great Anderssen, and in 1858 he made a very fair showing against the invincible Paul Morphy. From that time up to the Hastings tournament of this year he has constantly taken part in tournaments and matches, and, while never in the very first rank of players, he has met with enough success to entitle him to a hearing on behalf of his particular theories. At the outset he disavows any claim to absolute originality in his chess ideas, but he has always been known as a believer in certain irregular openings—particularly P to K B4—and his book is a somewhat rambling but decidedly entertaining plea for such openings, and in general for brilliant as opposed to "drawing-master's" chess. He points out that whereas, in the great match between Labourdonnais and McDonnell in 1833, no less than sixteen different openings were tried, the modern masters rarely venture beyond the Ruy Lopez or the queen's gambit. This lack of variety he attributes to the high stakes now played for, which give an undue importance to the mere fact of winning, with a resulting unwillingness on the part of the players to risk any but the safest and most deeply analyzed openings.

It is certainly curious that so little that is novel has been attempted in the openings during the last fifty years. In the 'Modern Chess Instructor,' published by Steinitz in 1889, the only two original suggestions, viz: P to Q 3 in the Ruy Lopez, and Kt to K R 3 in the Two Knights Defence, have not stood the test of practice, and have been abandoned by their author. On the other hand, it seems very doubtful whether Mr. Bird's elaborate arguments in favor of his special openings will carry conviction to the minds of other players. Writing before the recent meteoric appearance of young Pillsbury, Mr. Bird evidently regarded himself as almost the sole survivor of the school of Anderssen and Morphy, who aimed to mate or win, while the other players of the day had become imbued with the theories of Steinitz, who aims to avoid losing and to be certain of a draw. But, since this book was printed, a second Morphy has astonished the chess world, and the St. Petersburg tournament just over proved that some of Mr. Bird's theories will probably require revision. None of the four masters engaged in that tournament will be found to have offered a P to K B 4 opening.

Two Years on the Alabama. By Arthur Sinclair. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1895.

This book has a right to exist. Written by one of the line officers of the *Alabama* after a service coincident with the cruise of the vessel, it has certain advantages over Semmes's narrative in consequence of the subsidence of war passions and the settlement with England of the *Alabama* question. Semmes's narrative was in a turgid and inflated style, and bitter in partisanship and denunciation of the North. Sinclair, it is true, professes only to give a personal narrative of the cruise, but this practically includes all that is of general or professional interest, while in narration of facts he writes more pleasantly as well as more correctly than Semmes. He has taken considerable trouble to verify his statements, and he has also profited by data and criticisms that were probably unknown to Semmes.

After all that can be said as to the great vexation and pecuniary loss brought about during the civil war by the cruise of the *Alabama*, the fact remains, and stands out in clear light, that her career had no vital effect upon the course of the war. Semmes saw this, and laments it in his book, while Sinclair in turn remarks that, parallel with the success of the *Alabama* in her latter days, was the steady

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

failure of the war against the Union and the approaching downfall of the Southern Confederacy. Too much prominence cannot be given to the policy of Secretary Welles, steadily persisted in and so well justified by results, not to weaken the pressure of the blockade on the Southern States by a large diversion of force against the Confederate cruisers. The maintenance of this great naval operation was a vital element in the subjugation of the Confederacy, by destroying its commerce and depriving an agricultural country of manufactured articles which included military supplies of all kinds, and also gradually closing to it the market for its staple article, cotton, upon the sale of which it relied for outside aid and assistance—financial, political, military, and naval. The commerce destroying of the *Alabama* was insignificant in its results compared to this commerce suppression; and the command of the sea always with the North, despite the raids of the Confederate cruisers, not only kept the blockade intact, but brought the pressure from the sea responsive to that by land which encircled the States in rebellion and caused the success of the Union cause.

Lieut. Sinclair brings out more forcibly than most writers the English character of the crew of his vessel. The sympathy of English officials and of colonial authorities is an old story, but it is interesting to note what is said on page 146:

"The English," he says, "the foster-fathers of the *Alabama*, are naturally proud of their creation, and they appear to be also in sympathy with us and our cause. Our crew are about one-half English man-of-war's men, and have found among the sailors of the English squadron here many old shipmates, and doubtless they have already planned a glorious time together on shore the first liberty day."

The author's criticism of the neglect of our Navy Department to station a vessel at such salient points as the vicinity of Cape St. Roque, the Cape of Good Hope, Singapore, and similar positions, is well founded, and the neglect reflects upon the good judgment and wisdom of the naval advisers of Secretary Welles. Credit is given to Capt. C. H. Baldwin, commanding the *Vanderbilt*, for the best display of judgment in the pursuit of the *Alabama*. Humanly speaking, had it not been for the detention of the *Vanderbilt* by Admiral Wilkes, and (at a later time) for the enormous consumption of coal by the *Vanderbilt*, the captor of the *Alabama* would have been Baldwin instead of Winslow, and its fate met off the Cape of Good Hope or in the Indian Ocean rather than in the English Channel off Cherbourg. The greater part of the cruising and most of the captures of the *Alabama* were made under sail. Excellent sailing vessel that she was, her powers of keeping the sea far exceeded those possessed by the cruiser of to-day—the so-called commerce-destroyer — whose sail power has disappeared, and whose coal consumption, reduced by modern improvements, is newly taxed by the daily domestic demands for distilling, heating, electric lighting, and auxiliary engines. We prophesy that the next great war will witness the commerce-destroyer principally occupied with the duty of scout and convoy, commerce itself being duly convoyed or carried by vessels having swift pairs of heels.

Agreeing with Bullock, the author pays a high tribute to the special qualifications of Semmes for the work upon which his fame rests. One of these special qualifications was his knowledge of international law, which stood him in good stead in the many controversies he was engaged in during his cruise. It is probable, as the writer states, that Semmes, having made an especial study of this branch of naval training, had no equal in either navy. As a requisite for a well-educated naval officer it has not lost its importance in these later times, either in time of war or in the more extended period of peace.

The account of the final engagement of the *Alabama* is excellent. It is the best that we know of and is without hyperbole or exaggeration. The intention of Semmes to board the *Kearsarge* is dwelt upon, and the advantage that the superior speed of the *Kearsarge* gave in the avoidance of this purpose is well brought out. The failure to board, and the damaged condition of the *Alabama's* powder, the author seems to think were the principal causes of the defeat. The statement of the master of the *Deerhound*, the yacht which picked up Semmes, was, however, that "it was a fair stand-up fight. The two vessels were constructed of the same materials, and the chances at first seemed to be even enough." As to the use of the anchor chain of the *Kearsarge* for protection amidship, the author frankly acknowledges that Semmes knew of this use of the chain cable of the *Kearsarge*, and also that he could have adopted the same scheme from his own resources had he so desired. But the protection thus afforded was insignificant, as a perusal of Winslow's reports and the appendices giving the hits made and their localities will show. In regard to the mistake made by Semmes in consenting to an engagement, which in a large sense may be called a strategic mistake, the writer professes ignorance of its purpose. It was probably the mistake of a brave man stung by taunts as to want of courage to meet an equal. It is quite certain, too, as the author mentions, that a long detention for repairs at Cherbourg would have brought about that port a fleet of Union cruisers which would have prevented her safe departure.

The story of the cruise is as a whole well written, clear, and consecutive, excepting a pardonable repetition on page 114. This volume, with Bullock's account of the *Alabama's* origin and Semmes's account of her career, will probably constitute the definitive presentation of the remarkable cruise of the *Alabama* from the side of those who cruised in her.

Personal Reminiscences of Notable People. By Charles K. Tuckerman. 2 vols. Dodd, Mead & Co. 1895.

THESE two costly volumes purport to be only a *réchauffé* of what has already appeared in various magazines. They cover very different ground, the first dealing with the reminiscences of the author's earlier life, encountering various great men in America; the second founded on his diplomatic experience in the East, at Athens and Constantinople. It is hardly necessary to say that the latter series of anecdotes is much more novel and interesting than the former. The chapters which show the incurable procrastination and chicanery of the Turkish Government are well worth reading at the present day, when the great Powers of Europe and America, untaught by the experience of generations, are waiting for the Sultan to keep his engagements—in other words, for the Bosphorus to run dry. The rest of the book is gossipy, and of but little permanent value. A large number of stories, *e. g.*, that of the Duke of Wellington (i. 271), are distinctly stale; others, as that of Butler (i. 89), pretty flat. But the whole book produces an uneasy feeling from the frequent insertion of anecdotes leaving a mean impression of the individuals to whom they relate, with little or nothing to counteract it. Mr. Seward is almost the only person who, after passing under Mr. Tuckerman's eye, has not had some rip or tear in his moral garb exposed, or what is meant to appear such. Sometimes this effect is produced at the price of very inadequate knowledge. To say that Edward Everett "felt the leaden weight of disappointed ambition" (i. 33), that Abbott Lawrence (indicated as Mr. L——) acquired his manner by "studying his Talleyrand," is to convict Mr. Tuckerman of the most superficial knowledge of these eminent men.

These volumes, though generally written in good English, contain some disgraceful blunders—whether of author or printer is not always clear. "Blaine Washburne" appears (i. 84) as one person, between Thaddeus Stevens and Reverdy Johnson. Lord Ronald Gower becomes (i. 127) Lord Gower, by the eternal American blunder in similar titles. Two pages further on we have *statu quo* in the nominative for *status quo*. A well-known quotation has its point nearly spoilt by being given, "From grave to gay, from *serious* to severe" (i. 153). "Sonnambula" is twice printed "Somnambula" (i. 164, 190). "Maria Stuarda" becomes "Maria Stuarta" (i. 181). The famous answer, "Qu'il mourût," which our author puts into the mouth of Rachel, as *Camille*, belongs to the part of the old *Horatius* (i. 185). The French word *embonpoint* is wrongly used (i. 305), and Simon Pure (i. 319). Joaquin Miller is printed Joachim, as if it were a real name (ii. 13), "*Petits Lundis*" loses an *s* (ii. 105), "*Le Japon*" becomes "*La Japan*" (ii. 166), "*Jeunesse dorée*" loses its final *e* (ii. 245). The phrase *genus homo* is used as equivalent to the male sex (ii. 281). "*Grande Rue*" is altered to "*Grand Rue*" (ii. 341). When one has to pay five dollars for two small volumes, this is an extra allowance of mistakes.

Mars. By Percival Lowell. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1895.

MR. LOWELL'S book is charming in more ways than one. His facile pen would make easy reading of the driest subject; and when it deals with a theme so fascinating as that of the conditions of life on another planet, hard-hearted indeed must be the critic who does not find himself ready to embrace conclusions which he would have contemptuously rejected if reached by a rougher path. The author's enthusiasm for his subject is shown even more strongly by the enterprise on which the book is based than by what the latter sets forth. It is no commonplace spectacle, that of a man of not very easy leisure, perhaps in a situation where the ordinary mortal would have been completely engrossed in business, abandoning his home for nearly a year, and fitting up at no little expense an establishment in the deserts of Arizona, for the sole purpose of seeing from the best point of view what is going on in Mars. We feel that such an enterprise deserves some good result, and some more cheering word than that of the astronomer who remarked that Mr. Lowell had been very successful in discovering what he had announced his intention of finding before he set out.

From our guide over the oceans and continents of Mars we learn that our neighboring planet really has an atmosphere, though serious conflict with Prof. Campbell's opposite view is avoided by that atmosphere's being rarer than ours is at the tops of the Himalayas. Clouds rarely obscure the sunny skies, yet there is enough of watery vapor to condense into a snow-cap around either pole during its winter.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As spring advances, the cap slowly begins to melt away and form an ocean of blue water around its contracting boundary. Water is very scarce on the planet, and is growing scarcer from age to age, owing to its absorption into the body of the planet. The inhabitants have utilized the diminishing supply by an elaborate system of irrigation. Canals are dug which annually convey the water melting at either pole to the equatorial regions. A broad belt, thus watered into fertility, skirts each canal, and these belts, distinguished, by their vegetation, from the arid plains which form all the rest of the planet's surface, are seen from the earth as a network of fine lines.

The author cannot be charged with ignoring any obvious objections to his views. The latter are sustained by a wealth of illustration and a completeness of argument which leave nothing to be desired except credibility of foundation and conclusion. We do not object; we only feel that we know so little of the possible conditions on the surface of Mars that the chances are scores to one against any theory we can now frame being a true one. While commending Mr. Lowell's production to the general reader, we cannot deny that astronomers would everywhere have felt more confidence in his observations if he had been satisfied to confine himself to describing and picturing what he saw, without attempting to frame any theory, even in the innermost recesses of his mind. Without this precaution the most careful observer is liable to become a dupe of the "expectant attention" of the psychologists, and to see things in accord with his preconceived notions rather than with the facts. Especially is this the case in tracing markings so faint and shadowy as those on the surface of our neighboring planet.

New Orleans: The Place and the People. By Grace King. New York: Macmillan.

THE historian who, with impartial acumen, sifts a mass of documents in order to form a clear judgment of events long past, must speak with soberness of detail of the actors in a nation's life; their personality is lost sight of in the importance of the part they play. Yet if he confine himself exclusively to the broad lines of his subject, he will make his history very dry reading; if, running into the other extreme, he attempts to delineate individual character on too extensive a scale, his work will be little better than a voluminous compilation of biographies. The history of a city—especially of a relatively young city—presents a more circumscribed field; but if the first danger is minimized, to avoid the last is still more difficult; the founders, the actors in the development of the city are so near to us that the story of their deeds, transmitted by word of mouth from one generation to another, has all the charm or force of actuality. Tradition has not had time to become legendary. Corroborative evidence is not lacking. Hence, the temptation to write of individuals rather than of events must be great.

Miss Grace King has avoided both dangers in her new work on New Orleans. The accuracy of the historical part of the book is unimpeachable, and the documentary proofs testify to the industrious researches of the author. But the facts are presented in Miss King's usual graceful style, and there is nothing dry about them. Nor does the history proper form, as it were, a separate chapter, a narrative, soon ended, to introduce biographical compilations—as is the case with some other books on New Orleans. Here, from beginning to end, from the first exploration of the Mississippi to the present day, we see a succession of panoramic views, of *tableaux vivants*, in which the dramatis personæ—be they La Salle, Iberville, John Law, the Regent, Louis XV., O'Reilly, Villeré, Napoleon, Jackson, Lafitte the pirate, or Ben Butler, be they far or near—appear in a life-like delineation. It is history acted, not told. And while the eventful growth, the rise and fall of the old French city and its new life, are thus faithfully portrayed, the place itself, with its fading landmarks, its gayeties and days of mourning, its local celebrities and quaint characters, its heroes and benefactors, is described with a lightness of touch, a pathos and humor, which keeps the interest awake. The reader is loath to lay aside this handsome volume, profusely illustrated, with rare fidelity, by Frances E. Jones.

The Creoles are noted for their enthusiastic attachment for their city, and Miss King, herself a native, may be charged with partiality by those who do not know New Orleans; but to those who do, her book bears the stamp of truthfulness as well as of a generous enthusiasm. It will please the general reader also by the piquant show of manners and customs with which it abounds. Admirers of General Butler and of the carpet-bag régime, however, had better skip chapter xiii.—the only one which treats of "our late unpleasantness."

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Andreae, Percy. Stanhope of Chester. Rand, McNally & Co. 25c.
Balzac, H. de. Ursule Mirouët. London: Dent; New York: Macmillan. $1.50.
Binner, Paul. Old Stories Retold. Syracuse: C. W. Bardeen. 25c.
Bruce, Philip A. Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century. 2 vols. Macmillan. $6.
Chamberlain, A. F. The Child and Childhood in Folk-Thought. Macmillan. $3.
Dasent, Sir George. Tales from the Fjeld. From the Norse of P. Ch. Asbjörnsen. New ed. London: Gibbings & Co; New York: Putnams. $1.75.
Field, Eugene. The Love Affairs of a Bibliomaniac. Scribners. $1.25.
Fortescue, J. W. Dundonald. [English Men of Action.] Macmillan. 60c.
Frankel, Aaron H. Thou Shalt Not Kill: The "Thorah" of Vegetarianism. New York: The Author.
Godard, Harlow. An Outline Study of United States History. Syracuse: C. W. Bardeen. 50c.
Grasby, W. C. Teaching in Three Continents: Personal Notes of the Educational Systems of the World. Syracuse: C. W. Bardeen. $1.50.
Hillis, W. J. A Metrical History of the Life and Times of Napoleon Bonaparte. Putnams. $5.
Holman, S. W. Computation Rules and Logarithms. Macmillan.
James, B. W. Echoes of Battle. Philadelphia: H. T. Coates & Co. $2.
Labouchere, Norna. Ladies' Book-plates. London; Bell; New York: Macmillan. $3.
"La Gracieuse." Bibliothèque Enfantine. 10 vols. Brentanos. $2 25.
Michels and Ziegler. Thomas Morus: Utopia. [Lateinische Litteratur-denkmäler des XV. und XVI. Jahrhunderts.] Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
Nicoll, W. R. The Seven Words from the Cross. London: Hodder & Stoughton; New York: Dodd, Mead & Co. 50c.
Pennell, Joseph. The Illustration of Books. London: Unwin; New York: Century Co. $1.
Prothero, R. E. Letters and Verses of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley. Scribners. $5.
Purcell, E. S. Life of Cardinal Manning. 2 vols. Macmillan. $6
Quiller-Couch, A. T. Wandering Heath: Stories, Studies, and Sketches. Scribners. $1.25.
Raynor, Cecil. The Spinster's Scrip. Macmillan. $1.
Renan, Ernest. Life of Jesus. Translation newly revised. Boston: Roberts Bros. $2.50.
Russell, C. E. Blossoms of Thought. Boston: *Arena* Publishing Co.
Sala, G. A. Life and Adventures. 2 vols. Scribners. $3.
Sayce, Prof. A. H. The Egypt of the Hebrews and Herodotos. Macmillan. $2.
Schmoller, Gustav. The Mercantile System [Economic Classics]. Macmillan. 75c.
Stedman, E. C., and Woodberry, G. E. The Works of Edgar Allan Poe. Vols. VI.-X. Chicago: Stone & Kimball. Each $1.50.
Stuart, Eleanor. Stonepastures. Appleton. 75c.
Vogüé, E. M. de. Russian Portraits. Putnams. 50c.
Walden, Treadwell. The Great Meaning of Metanoia. Thomas Whittaker. $1.
Walford, L. B. Successors to the Title. Appletons. $1.
Watson, Rev. John ("Ian McLaren"). The Upper Room. Dodd, Mead & Co. 50c.
Weale, W. H. J. Gerard David. [*Portfolio* Monographs.] Macmillan.
Webb-Peploe, Rev. H. W. The Victorious Life. Baker & Taylor Co. $1.25.
White, A. M. Outlines of Legal History. London: Sonnenschein; New York: Macmillan. $2.
Wichert, Ernst. An der Majorsecke. Henry Holt & Co. 20c.

"*IT IS TO ME OF THE UTMOST WORTH in my work.*"—PREST. THWING of Western Reserve University.

FEBRUARY

EDUCATIONAL REVIEW.

ARTICLES.—The Higher Education of Women, by John Tetlow; Anthropometrical Measurements in Schools, by William Townsend Porter; The Ethics of the Public School, by Preston W. Search; Interest: Some Objections to It, by Frank M. McMurry; The Future of the High School, by Francis W. Kelsey.
DISCUSSIONS.—The Psychology of Educational Fads, by Jacquea W. Redway; An Imperfect Correlation, by A. F. Ames; Shall we Introduce the Military System in Schools? by C. W. Fowler.
REVIEWS. EDITORIALS.

35c. per copy. $3.00 per year (monthly excepting July and August).

☞ *A circular containing the contents of the Educational Review—Vols. I.-X. (Jan. '91-Dec. '95)—free on application.*

HENRY HOLT & CO.,
29 WEST 23D STREET, NEW YORK.

JUST READY.

The Literary Study of the Bible.

An account of the leading forms of literature represented in the sacred writings. By RICHARD G. MOULTON, Professor of Literature in English at the University of Chicago. Large 12mo. 545 pages, cloth, $2.00.

D. C. HEATH & CO., Publishers,
Boston, New York, Chicago.

Books of To-day and 'Belinda' Suppt.

The Best Monthly Review of English Books for American Readers.

Annual Subscription 3s. 6d., post free.

HATCHARDS,
Booksellers to the Queen,
187 PICCADILLY, · LONDON.

Do me the favor to ask your wine-merchant, or Park & Tilford (wholesale agents), for my "*Picarillo*" natural sherry, and "*Manzanilla Pasada.*"
GUILLERMO DOBLACHE,
Puerto de Santa Maria.

Letters of Credit.

We buy and sell Bills of Exchange on and make Cable Transfers of money to Europe, Australia, and the West Indies; also make collections and issue Commercial and Travellers' Credits, available in all parts of the world.

Brown Brothers & Co., Bankers,
NO. 59 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

YALE MIXTURE.

The choicest tobacco made, and pre-eminently a gentleman's smoke.

Marburg Bros., The American Tobacco Co., Successor, Baltimore, Md.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LEMCKE & BUECHNER,

Formerly B. Westermann & Co.,

812 Broadway, ... New York.

Will publish immediately:

Flügel-Schmidt-Tanger,

School and Hand Lexicon of the German and English Languages.

2 vols., large 8vo, half leather, $4.50.

The German-English part separately $2.60, the long-expected smaller edition of Flügel's 3 vol. Dictionary; half morocco, $16.50.

LIBRARIES

Supplying Private and Public Libraries with Books our **SPECIALTY.** A List of standard and new issues of all publishers mailed on request. Lists priced gratis. Test our figures.

THE BAKER & TAYLOR CO.,

WHOLESALE BOOKS,

5 and 7 East Sixteenth St., New York.

A NEW ERA IN BOOKSELLING.

BRENTANO'S, 31 Union Square, announce an important change of policy. Hereafter they will sell books at SWEEPING REDUCTIONS from PUBLISHERS' PRICE. Bookbuyers will thus be afforded the opportunity to purchase from an unrivalled stock of Classic, Standard, and Current Literature, at PRICES as LOW as prevail ANYWHERE, with the added advantage of prompt and intelligent service.

ALL the BOOKS of THE DAY at LOWEST PRICES. Foreign Books.

Mail orders receive special attention.

Send for Brentano's Monthly List of New Books. Free on application. BRENTANO'S,

Publishers, Booksellers, Stationers, Newsdealers,

31 Union Square, New York.

ORIENTAL LANGUAGES.

MESSRS. SAMPSON LOW, MARSTON & COMPANY, English, American, and Oriental Publishers, St. Dunstan's House, Fetter Lane, London, Eng., will be happy to send, post free, on application, their 16-page Catalogue of Class Books, Dictionaries, Classics, etc., in Hindustani, Hindi, Sanscrit, Persian, Bengali, Arabic, Malay, etc., etc

F. W. CHRISTERN

(DYRSEN & PFEIFFER, Suc'rs),

254 Fifth Ave., between 28th and 29th Sts., New York,

Importers of Foreign Books; Agents for the leading Paris Publishers; Tauchnitz's British Authors, Teubner's Greek and Latin Classics. Catalogues of stock mailed on demand. New books received from Paris and Leipzig as soon as issued.

FRENCH BOOKS.

MEYER BROS. & CO.,

1127 Broadway, bet. 25th and 26th Sts., N.Y.

French Books, Photographs, School Books, Newspapers.

Send for Catalogues. Also our monthly French publication, *L'Echo de France*, giving reviews and list of all French Books Sample copy *free!*

ELLIS & ELVEY,

Dealers in Old and Rare Books.

CATALOGUES OF CHOICE BOOKS AND ILLUMINATED MANUSCRIPTS published periodically.

Rare Early English Literature, Early Printed Books in Black-Letter, Ancient Artistic Bookbindings, rare Prints and Autographs, etc. Only fine specimens are dealt with.

29 NEW BOND STREET, LONDON, W.

Foreign Books. Subscriptions to Foreign Periodicals. Tauchnitz British authors. Catalogues on application. CARL SCHOENHOF, 23 School St., Boston.

BACK NUMBERS, VOLS., AND SETS of the *Nation*, as also of all periodicals, bought, sold, and exchanged by A. S. CLARK, 174 Fulton Street, west of Broadway, New York.

BACK numbers and sets of all magazines. For price state wants to AMERICAN MAGAZINE EXCHANGE, De Menil Building, St. Louis, Mo.

H. WILLIAMS, 25 EAST 10TH ST., N.Y., dealer in Magazines and other Periodicals. Sets, volumes, or single numbers.

Complete Index to Littell's Living Age, to the end of 1895. E. ROTH, 1135 Pine St., Phila.

NOW READY.

Volume III. of the Economic Studies of the University of Chicago.

THE HISTORY

OF THE

Indian Silver Currency

By KARL ELLSTAETTER.

Translated from the German by Prof. J. LAURENCE LAUGHLIN of the University of Chicago. Large 8vo, cloth, 132 pp, with tables and charts. Price $1.25 *net*.

Professor Laughlin has rendered all students of the Silver Question a great service in providing this translation of Dr. Elstaetter's valuable work. No compendium on the history of the Indian Silver Currency and its industrial relations exists in English. To obtain correct facts hitherto one must have ransacked the voluminous pages of the English Blue-books.

Dr. Elstaetter's study effectively treats the effect of the Silver Question on the price of wheat; whether depreciated silver acts as an export bounty; and how the industrial and financial system of India affects prices and indebtedness. It is clear, brief, and comprehensive, giving the general reader a full insight into the Silver question as it touches India, Indian trade, and the policy of silver-using countries. *It deals with facts, not with theories.*

PREVIOUS VOLUMES OF

THE ECONOMIC STUDIES

I. The Science of Finance.

An authorized translation of Gustav Cohn's *Finanzwissenschaft*, by Dr. T. B. VEBLEN, of The University of Chicago. Now ready. Large 8vo, cloth, 12+800 pages. Price, $3.50 *net*.

II. History of the Union Pacific Railway

By HENRY KIRKE WHITE. Large 8vo, cloth, about 150 pages. Price, $1.50 *net*.

Address,

The University of Chicago Press,

CHICAGO, ILL.

FRENCH BOOKS.

ROMANS CHOISIS.—A series, pure, of high literary value and representative of the authors; printed in large type on good paper. Price, cloth, 85c; paper, 60c.

No. 17. SANS FAMILLE. By Hector Malot. Abridged. 430 pages.

No. 18. COSIA. By Andre Michel Durand. 165 pages.

No. 19. MON ONCLE ET MON CURE. By Jean de la Brete. 257 pages.

No. 20. LA LIZARDIERE. By Henri de Bornier. 247 pages

Complete catalogue on application. For sale by all booksellers, or postpaid on receipt of price by the publisher,

WILLIAM R. JENKINS,

851 and 853 Sixth Ave. (48th St.), New York.

MAYER & MÜLLER, Booksellers.

51 Markgrafenst., Berlin (Germany).

Direct supply, at best terms, of GERMAN NEW AND SECOND-HAND BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, and PERIODICALS in any department of Learning and Literature. *Cheapest opportunity* for Libraries, Professors, and Students. Catalogues on application. Best references.

C. A. KOEHLER & CO., 149a Tremont St. (Lawrence Building, Corner West St.), BOSTON, MASS. FOREIGN BOOKS Importations from Europe. Catalogues on application.

OFFICE OF THE

Atlantic Mutual

INSURANCE COMPANY,

NEW YORK, January 21, 1896.

The Trustees, in conformity with the Charter of the Company, submit the following Statement of its affairs on the 31st of December, 1895:

Premiums on Marine Risks from 1st January, 1895, to 31st December, 1895,		$2,622,872 42
Premiums on Policies not marked off 1st January, 1895		1,027,151 41
Total Marine Premiums		$3,650,023 83
Premiums marked off from 1st January, 1895, to 31st December, 1895		$2,540,748 83
Losses paid during the same period	$1,218,407 55	
Returns of Premiums and Expenses	$603,415 82	

The Company has the following Assets, viz.:

United States and City of New York Stock; City Banks and other Stocks	$8,059,105 00
Loans secured by Stocks and otherwise	1,216,500 00
Real Estate and Claims due the Company, estimated at	1,000,004 90
Premium Notes and Bills Receivable	896,431 88
Cash in Bank	202,518 33
Amount	$11,374,560 11

Six per cent interest on the outstanding certificates of profits will be paid to the holders thereof, or their legal representatives, on and after Tuesday, the fourth of February next.

The outstanding certificates of the issue of 1890 will be redeemed and paid to the holders thereof, or their legal representatives, on and after Tuesday, the fourth of February next, from which date all interest thereon will cease. The certificates to be produced at the time of payment, and cancelled.

A dividend of FORTY PER CENT. is declared on the net earned premiums of the Company for the year ending 31st December, 1895, for which certificates will be issued on and after Tuesday, the fifth of May next.

By order of the Board,

J. H. CHAPMAN, Secretary.

TRUSTEES.

W. H. H. Moore,	George Bliss,	Anson W. Hard,
A. A. Raven,	John L. Riker,	Isaac Bell,
Jos. H. Chapman,	C. A. Hand,	Joseph Agostini,
James Low,	John D. Hewlett,	Vernon H. Brown,
Jas. G. DeForest,	Gustav Amsinck,	Leander N. Lovell,
William Degroot,	N. Denton Smith,	Everett Frazar,
William H. Webb,	Chas. H. Marshall,	Wm. B. Boulton,
Horace Gray,	Chas D. Leverich,	Geo. W. Quintard,
C. de Thomsen,	Edw'd Floyd-Jones,	Paul L. Thebaud,
Chas P. Burdett,	George H Macy,	Jno B. Woodward,
Henry E. Hawley,	Lawrence Turnure,	George Coppell,
Wm. E Dodge,	Waldron P. Brown.	

W. H. H. MOORE, President.
A. A. RAVEN, Vice-President.
F. A. PARSONS, 2d Vice-President.

KNABE PIANOS

UNEQUALLED IN

TONE, TOUCH, WORKMANSHIP, AND DURABILITY.

Baltimore, 22 and 24 E. Baltimore St. New York, 148 5th Ave. near 20th St. Washington, 1422 Penna. Ave., N. W.

"NO ONE who smokes the 'ARCADIA MIXTURE' would ever attempt to describe its delights."

—J. M. BARRIE, in "My Lady Nicotine."

Samples sent for 25 cents.

THE SURBRUG CO., Makers, 37 Dey St., N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED